E 376
.V36
Copy 1

# THE PAPERS OF SIR CHARLES R. VAUGHAN

## 1825-1835

EDITED BY JOHN A. DOYLE

REPRINTED FROM THE

American Historical Review

VOL. VII NOS. 2 AND 3 JANUARY AND APRIL 1902

[Reprinted from The American Historical Review, Vol. VII., No. 2, Jan., 1902.]

# DOCUMENTS

## *The Papers of Sir Charles Vaughan.*

(*First Installment.*)

Most of those who have studied the social history of England in the nineteenth century as revealed in memoirs and letters are acquainted with the name of Sir Henry Halford, the physician to the King. But in all likelihood only a few think of him as originally bearing the name of Vaughan and belonging to a family of exceptionally wide-spread and varied distinction. One of Sir Henry Halford's brothers was a judge. Another was head of Merton College, Oxford, and after the comfortable fashion of that age of pluralities combined with that post the deanery of Merton. The seventh son of the family, Charles, won a position in his own profession, that of diplomacy, fully as distinguished as that of any of the family. A portion of his career should have a special interest for American readers and with that I propose to deal.

That the two best known members of the family should have won distinction through medicine and diplomacy was but appropriate. At a later day Charles Vaughan labored not a little to trace his pedigree to the fountain-head and to establish a connection with that great Welsh house which claimed the poet Henry Vaughan, the self-styled "Silurist" as a member. No claim of connection could be found and Charles Vaughan had to be contented with tracing the family line back to his great-grandfather who graduated in medicine at Leyden and who married the daughter of Sir Henry Newton, a diplomatist of rare repute. Thus the chief traditions of the family were in those lines, medicine and diplomacy, in which two of the best known members of it afterwards won distinction.

Charles Vaughan was born on December 20, 1774. He was brought up at Rugby School and at Merton College, Oxford, and was in 1798 elected to a fellowship at All Souls' College in that University. That supplemented by the bequest of a small property from one of his mother's kinsmen saved him from being driven by need into any precipitate choice of a profession. His early aspirations were towards his father's calling, medicine, and before becoming a fellow at Oxford he studied medicine for two years at

Edinburgh. There was, however, in Charles Vaughan something, in the better sense of the word, of the adventurer and a good deal of the citizen of the world. The tradition of Welsh descent was as we have seen no more than conjecture. But there was assuredly in Vaughan no small share of the winning and versatile temperament of the Celt. He was neither a profound thinker nor a profound student. But he was acute and observant and such as his mental resources were, natural and acquired, they were all in available small change. Of his own letters no great number are known to be extant. But he was addicted, to a perilous extent, to hoarding the letters of his friends, and what a man receives is hardly less a key to his nature than what he writes. The letters of Vaughan's correspondents plainly show that he had the gift of winning confidence and good-will readily from men of all sorts and conditions. He is constantly doing small kindnesses pleasantly and graciously. His friends look to him for advice in practical difficulties. He is one of those who, without theories of life, see the practical bearings of an emergency and the safe way out of it. He had too the outward graces which are helpful to men in most walks of life and certainly not least in diplomacy. His portraits show us a face of regular and high-bred beauty with an expression full of keenness and purpose, and their evidence is confirmed by those who remember the original.

Vaughan's walk was assuredly that for which above all others his temper and habit of mind fitted him. But the chief impulse from without was given by what we call chance. In 1803 the University of Oxford elected Vaughan to a travelling fellowship, tenable for five years. These years were spent in France, Spain and the Levant, and in adventurous wanderings through western Asia which finally landed Vaughan at St. Petersburg. The resource, the knowledge of and interest in all sorts and conditions of men, thus developed, were an invaluable portion of Vaughan's training as a diplomatist. He kept full and it must be confessed often rather dull journals. Of these some were lost in a shipwreck on the Caspian. But enough survive to show Vaughan's taste for close observation, his keen interest in all the details of the economic life which he saw about him. His temper throughout is the temper of the man of affairs, the shrewd, practical observer, interested in details and not fettered by theories. He has always a keen and observant eye for economical matters. He admires scenery conventionally; he is genuinely interested in crops and manufactures. The every-day comedy of life, the details of incident and character, attract him; he is all the time developing a

natural faculty for dealing promptly and on short acquaintance with a succession of men wholly differing in stations and habits.

In 1806 at St. Petersburg he formed the acquaintance of Charles Stuart, afterwards Lord Stuart de Rothesay. That was in a sense the turning point of Vaughan's life. Two years later Stuart was sent out by the English government to watch British interests in the Spanish peninsula and as opportunity offered to organize resistance to Napoleon. Stuart saw that Vaughan's age, temper and antecedents, especially the knowledge of Spain and of the Spanish language, which he had acquired in his travels, would make him a useful subordinate, and he appointed him as his private secretary. Vaughan's sympathies with the Spanish cause soon found vent in a practical and one may say in some sort a permanent form. In a letter to his sister he says, "I must see the gallant Palafox before my return to England." The design was carried out. Vaughan visited Palafox, was entertained by him for a time and accompanied him as a volunteer in the campaign. This intimacy and a visit to Saragossa itself enabled Vaughan to produce a short account of the siege of that town, which was published in England early in the following year. Vaughan himself states in the preface that his main object in publishing was a practical one, to raise a fund for the relief of the people of Saragossa, distressed by one siege and threatened by another. One can hardly doubt too that Vaughan felt that he was at the same time in a perfectly legitimate way advancing his own interests by establishing a reputation as an authority on Spanish affairs.

In more than one respect Vaughan's Spanish experiences served as a valuable training for his later American duties. One of the problems forced upon his notice during his time of service at Washington was the internal condition of Mexico and also the relation of Spain to her revolted dependencies. In both these matters it was of great service to him to be familiar with Spanish habits of thought and Spanish methods of political action. Throughout Vaughan's career at Washington, his views are marked by what one may call a sane optimism. He over and over again insists on the fact that though American politicians may say unfair and indiscreet things, though American citizens may collectively seem reckless and irresponsible, yet there is always an underlying current of common sense on which we may rely. To distinguish the surface froth from the better elements which underlie it and which really go far to make up national life, this was a lesson which Vaughan had mainly learned from his experience of the Peninsula war.

Once entered on the career of diplomacy Vaughan's progress was at once rapid and sure. We find him returning to England during the course of the war, consulted officially by the Marquis of Wellesley and privately by William Windham. One incident is specially noteworthy. It was Vaughan's melancholy duty to convey to Sir John Moore the news of the Spanish defeat at Tudela, news which told the British general that his own position had become untenable. Of Vaughan's interview with Moore only one recorded incident remains, interesting enough in itself. At a later day Vaughan wrote that Moore had told him it was impossible to defend Portugal without having command of Spain, a view which, as Vaughan points out, was disproved by Wellington at Torres Vedras.

Upon the conclusion of the war and the restoration of Ferdinand, Vaughan remained in office at Madrid as chief secretary to the British embassy. If a full view of the worst and meanest side of royalty be a good training for one who has to deal with a democracy, assuredly Vaughan enjoyed it to the full. During the darkest days of the struggle he had never lost heart and hope. But there must have been moments afterwards when he was tempted to ask

> "In God's name then what curse befell us
> To fight for such a thing."

Vaughan's papers are full of passages, illustrating the levity, the moral worthlessness and the political incapacity of the King. While the government is ostentatiously carrying on a crusade against houses of ill fame, the person at the head of it is engaged in an intrigue with a girl of low station. Political importance is given to this by the fact that the mother of the royal mistress is trafficking in public offices.

"The leading feature in the character of Ferdinand," Vaughan writes, "is a distrust of every one but particularly of his Ministers and an inclination to deceive them, and it is remarkable that all those who have been suddenly disgraced by him and dismissed and banished from his court have been convinced just previously to their fall that they enjoyed the most unbounded favour and confidence, some unusual mark of familiarity or acquiescence in their opinions having been manifested towards them by the King. To Ferdinand's natural distrust and inclination to deceive is added a temper incapable of forming any attachment or friendship." And this last charge is supported by numerous instances where he betrayed the adherents who had stood by him in poverty and exile. From Madrid Vaughan went in 1820 to the embassy at Paris. Three

years later he was for the first time placed at the head of an embassy, that at Berne, and in 1825 he was appointed to Washington.

The best and simplest way of dealing with Vaughan's career in America will be to consider in succession the various specific questions on which disputes or at least discussions arose and then to touch on his despatches so far as they illustrate important issues on the internal politics of the Republic. These topics include :

(1) Various questions which might arise out of the breaking up of Spanish America into independent republics. (2) Disputes as to the boundary which separated New Brunswick from Maine. (3) Steadily increasing friction as to the reciprocal advantages to be mutually awarded to America and Great Britain in commerce, especially in commerce with the West Indies. (4) That ever recurring bone of contention, the right of search and impressment, complicated and embittered by a cognate question, the suppression of the slave trade.

By a fortunate chance Ward, the British representative in Mexico, had been formerly a colleague of Vaughan in Spain. In 1827 Ward was superseded in consequence of his extravagance and was succeeded by Pakenham, who had served under Vaughan at Berne. Both were of something the same mental stamp, acute, self-reliant and somewhat prejudiced ; both were copious letter-writers and thus we get in their correspondence with Vaughan pictures of Mexican politics and of the relations of Mexico towards Great Britain and the United States, often no doubt prejudiced, but always vigorous and original. Each regarded with intense suspicion the American minister, Poinsett. There is a touch of irony in the fact that when all memory of his supposed Machiavellianism has faded away, Poinsett should be enjoying such immortality as the name of a flower can bestow on its discoverer.

According to Ward, Poinsett was in everything aiming shrewdly and somewhat unscrupulously at building up American influence in Mexico ; he induced Mexico to consent to the doctrine that free bottoms make free goods ; but he did so by a concession, embodied in a secret article, to the effect that during the war between Spain and Mexico all American vessels carrying Spanish goods, west of San Antonio and fairly within the Gulf of Mexico should be lawful prize. He was also purposely leaving the question of boundary in a state of ambiguity so as to give opening for future aggression.

The chief difficulty in the relations between Mexico and the United States, the struggle for Texas, is as yet no more than an undefined cloud on the horizon, but it is there. As early as 1826 Ward in a letter to Vaughan, to which I have already referred, dis-

cusses the American designs on Texas. The boundary will be left undecided. There will be a gradual influx of American settlers. Already Poinsett has been trying to float a land company for Texas in New York and promising the support of the government. The territory will have become American *de facto* before the question of right is fairly settled. There is also among Vaughan's papers a remarkable memorandum dated Mexico, Feb. 18, 1830, and headed secret. It does not read like the writing of Pakenham and is more probably a translation of some document written by a Mexican and addressed either to Pakenham or Vaughan. It sets forth the case very clearly from a strongly anti-American point of view. It opens by declaring that "the History of the United States is one of steady and continuous encroachment, not with the noisy pomp of conquest, but with silence, perseverance and uniformity." Mexican influence in Texas is to be gradually undermined by a steady in-pouring of squatters from the United States. Already the law of emancipation passed by the Mexican government has been set at defiance. Yet in a later paragraph the writer qualifies this by admitting that the law as applied to Texas has been modified, owing to the difficulty of enforcement. The writer goes on to point out the special value of Texas as a province of Mexico for agricultural purposes, for the production of ship timber and for internal navigation. Such a province close at hand, enjoying the advantages of slave labor, will be a formidable rival to the really Spanish portion of Mexico. Yet the writer's remedial proposals are utterly futile. The coasting trade between Texas and the rest of Mexico is to be developed. Texas itself is to be used as a settlement for convicts, and so garrisoned against encroachments. It would be difficult to imagine a scheme more certain to bring about the very result dreaded. We see from Pakenham's reports that the ultimate annexation of Texas must not be looked on as an isolated act, but as the culmination of a train of events, of which, when once started, the conclusion was well-nigh inevitable.

Another source of anxiety to Vaughan and his correspondents is the likelihood of Mexico in conjunction with one of the other Spanish-American republics attempting to seize Cuba. Fortunately the danger is lessened by a cumbrous provision in the Mexican constitution which, while it left the President free to employ the navy as he pleased, made the concurrence of the House of Deputies necessary for any land operations. Clay was the American foreign secretary and he and Vaughan were fully agreed as to the necessity for checking any such attempt. It might, Clay sees, entangle America in difficulties with the powers of the Old World and it

might bring about a servile insurrection, a prospect which at once filled the South with the dread of "*proximus ardet.*" Clay hopes that some good may come from Russian intervention. Vaughan has little hope in that quarter. He is more inclined to rely on the fact that the Spanish Government has "most unaccountably contrived to put Havannah in a respectable state of defence"—a sarcasm clearly based on recollection of the Peninsula war.

The danger of the United States's being dragged in is increased by the fact that Porter, the commander of the Mexican fleet, was an ex-officer in the United States navy. Poinsett too is, one may say of course, suspected of giving underhand encouragement to these schemes which his government disavows. Yet strange to say Vaughan mentions a report current at Washington, that certain Spaniards in Cuba were plotting a counter-revolution in Mexico and that Poinsett was abetting them. It would seem as if Poinsett was one of those unhappy men who through some defect of manner and character, contrive to excite suspicion and to have a reputation for duplicity far in excess of their real deserts. It is clear too that the Mexican government was trying to play off the two powers, England and America one against the other. Poinsett's successor, Butler, apparently an upright and truthful man, told Pakenham that he had been assured by the Mexican government that in any quarrel with America, Mexico would have the support of England.

Mexico is not the only one of the newly created Spanish-speaking republics of which we learn something from these papers. There is among them a despatch from Colonel Campbell, the English representative in Colombia, drawing a melancholy picture of that country, honeycombed with intrigues and only redeemed by the honesty and public spirit of Bolivar. One passage in a letter of Campbell's is interesting as showing how among thoughtful Americans something of a reaction was setting in from the buoyant self-confidence of Jefferson and his school. In April, 1829, Campbell writes to Vaughan: "General Harrison [the American minister in Colombia] declared in a large company in my presence that Federation would be the ruin of any of the new States and that even in the United States they found the greatest difficulty in making the system work from the almost impossibility of distinguishing between the powers of the individual state and the Union." There are alarming rumours too of repudiation. But this will probably be checked, Campbell thinks, by the respect which was felt in Colombia for the public opinion of Europe.

The following letters reproduced as they appear in the Vaughan papers[1] throw light on the question of the interoceanic canal, and on other problems growing out of the South American conditions as well as on other diplomatic questions of the time.

JOHN A. DOYLE.

1. VAUGHAN TO CANNING.

WASHINGTON. 2. October 1826.

*Mr. Canning,*

*Sir,* Mr. Palmer of New York, who calls himself the "general Agent[2] of the Central American and United States Atlantic and Pacific Canal Company,"[3] has lately been at Washington, and I have the honor to inclose an article, which has appeared in the newspapers, purporting to give an abstract of the terms and conditions of the contract lately entered into by a company at New York and the Republic of Guatemala.

By the inclosed article it appears, that the canal across the isthmus of Panama by the lake of Nicaragua, is to be navigable for ships: that the Republic of Guatemala is bound to permit the cutting of timber for the works—to furnish plans and charts, to procure workmen, and to indemnify the owners of lands—The accounts of the Company are to be audited every six months by the Republic, and interest at the rate of 10 per cent, to be allowed upon the sums expended.

The company is to receive two thirds of the amount of duties and after the payments by the Republic of the capital vested in the canal, the Company is to be entitled for seven years, to receive one half of the nett proceeds, and to have the exclusive privilege of navigating the canal with steam boats for 20 years, free of duties, the Company to fix the amount to be paid for freight on board steam-boats, and for towing vessels through the canal.

Thus the navigation of the Canal will be completely in the hands of the Company formed in the United States, though the Contract provides that the navigation shall be common to all friendly and neutral nations, without any exclusive privilege.

[1] At the death of Sir Charles Vaughan his papers passed into the possession of his nephew, the second Sir Henry Halford, and passed from him to his son the third baronet, upon whose death they were transferred to All Souls' College, Oxford. They were left with the understanding that Mr. Doyle was to have custody and use of them. The collection is a miscellaneous one, a great mass of private correspondence, memoranda of all sorts, pamphlets, newspaper extracts, and copies of diplomatic correspondence, as well as full journals of Vaughan's travels. Most of the letters printed above are themselves copies probably made by one of Vaughan's staff.—ED.

[2] See Niles's *Register*, Vol. 31, pp. 2, 3, 72, 73.—ED.

[3] The directors of the Company were DeWitt Clinton, Stephen Van Rensselaer, Morris Robinson, Edward Livingston, Charles J. Catlett. Full accounts will be found in *House Reports* Thirtieth Congress, Second Session, No. 145, especially pp. 362–375.—ED.

It is said that the estimate of the expence to be borne by the Company, does not exceed half a million of Dollars, and that the subscription has been filled up at New York.

As this Canal is to pass by the river San Juan and the lake Nicaragua it is supposed that the excavation will not exceed seventeen miles.

II. VAUGHAN TO CANNING.

WASHINGTON. 20. Octr. 1826.

*Mr. Canning,*

*Sir,* I have already taken notice to you of a company at New York, which have obtained a contract from the Govt. of Guatemala for making a ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama by the lake Nicaragua. Having observed, that the Agent of the Company was at Washington, about the time of Mr. Clay's return, I took an opportunity of asking him what countenance this Govt. was likely to give to that scheme.

Mr. Clay informed me that the agent of that Company had been indefatigable in his endeavours to engage through himself and other ministers, the Government of the United States to take part in this contract, but that it was resolved that the Govt. should have nothing to do with it in any shape.

If the Canal was to be made by any foreign power he should not regret that it fell to the lot of Americans to effect it, but that he was convinced that it must be carried into effect with the consent of all nations, studiously avoiding any privileges reserved for any one.

I could not collect from Mr. Clay, that his Govt. entertained a better opinion of the capability of the company to effect the enterprize which they have undertaken than which may be collected from public report.

III. VAUGHAN TO CANNING.

WASHINGTON. 30. Sepr. 1825.

*Sir,* the American Minister of State, Mr. Clay, has informed me, that he has received from Mr. Rufus King, a report of an interview which the latter has had with you, in which he tells me that a coincidence of opinion, and a frank unreserved expression of your sentiments had prevailed in a manner to render that report most interesting and satisfactory.

Mr. Clay went on to tell me, that after the last battle which took place in Spanish America, and which seemed to have completely destroyed the Royalist army, the United States had conceived that it would be worth while to endeavour to get the influence of Russia to bear upon the Court of Spain, in order to bring about a peace between the latter and its late American Provinces.* Mr. Clay then read to me a note, in which the Govt. of the United States recapitulated to the Emperor of Russia the leading features attending the separation of the Spanish American Colonies, the importance of preserving to Spain the Islands of Cuba and

Porto Rico and pressed upon the consideration of the Emperor many other points which it is unnecessary for me to attempt to recapitulate as I understand that a copy of this representation has been laid before you.[1] I observed that it was dated the 10th. of May 1825 and I understand that no answer had yet been received to it.

Mr. Clay afterwards put into my hands, a letter which he had received from Mr. Rufus King (a copy of which I have the honor to inclose), in which he transmitted to Mr. Clay a copy of a letter which you had addressed to him dated Wortley Hall August 7th.

Having been made acquainted with these papers, I was naturally anxious to collect what impression had been made by the proposition contained in your letter to Mr. King. Mr. Clay observed to me, that it was his conviction, that Spain was to be acted upon only through her fears, or her interests, and that when Spain once felt secure about Cuba, by the combined declaration of other powers, that she would then more obstinately persist in refusing peace to her American Provinces.

Mr. Clay however seemed very sensible of the importance of any measure that should bind *France*[2] within the same line of Policy and forbearance with regard to Cuba which was laid down by Gt. Britain and the United States, and he read to me part of letter from the American Minister at Madrid, dated in July last, from whence I inferred, that jealousy had been entertained here of the projects of France with regard to Cuba, as the letter stated, that the most positive assurances had just been given him that the King of Spain had never had the intention for a moment of ceding either Cuba or Porto Rico to France or to any other power.

Mr. Clay observed to me that if France continued to send large Squadrons of ships of war into the West Indian Seas she must expect that in future other States would require an explanation of their objects. That the occupation of Cuba by a French force would be just grounds of war on the part of the United States. He expressed to me his conviction that sooner or later the Island of Cuba would become independent of Spain—That its continued dependence on Spain, as at present, was in his opinion, was the most desirable thing that could happen, it being impossible to consent to its falling into the hands of any maritime State. But its independence might require the guarantee of those States, or it might be annexed to the Republic of Colombia or of Mexico. His views upon this subject as detailed to me, coincided with those which he had formerly stated to Mr. Addington and which that gentleman reported to you in his Dispatch marked separate of the 21st. May 1825.

[1] See *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 544; VII. 8–10, 15, 88.—Ed.

[2] This is brought out clearly as the policy of the government in Adams's conference with the Russian minister, *Memoirs*, VII. 10. On August 21, some five weeks before the date of the letter above given, Poinsett had written Clay concerning a rumored attack by a French fleet upon Cuba and Mexico. The English and American ministers acted together on the matter and the Mexican government, with the approval of our minister, referred in its notes to the principle of the Monroe doctrine. *Am. St. Papers, For. Rel.*, V. 909.—Ed.

Mr. Poinsett the Minister from the United States at Mexico, has given information that the agents from the disaffected at Cuba are very busy in that City, in persuading the Govt. to fit out an expedition for the purpose of effecting their independence and Mr. Clay believes that the Republic of Colombia is disposed to act in concert with that of Mexico.[1] It was evident that Mr. Clay considered the dependence of Cuba upon those Republics, as preferable only to the intervention of any European Power, that of the United States being impossible.

Though I did not feel myself called upon to give any opinion upon the proposed plans with which I had become acquainted, by the papers which he had allowed me to read, I could not help expressing my satisfaction upon finding that some means had been devised, which might possibly end in calming all our uneasiness, about the intervention of the French on the one hand in the valuable Islands belonging to Spain, and on the other from the doubtful chance of any satisfactory settlement of their independence of the new Republics of Mexico and Colombia. I ventured to observe also that if a suspension of arms could only be obtained from the projected representation to the Spanish Govt., it would have the best effect upon the interior of the Spanish American Provinces and that it would contribute to check the piratical adventures upon those coasts, which had given our respective Govts. so much trouble.

I am sorry that I cannot after all that passed between myself and Mr. Clay, form any distinct notion of what will probably be his instructions to Mr. King respecting the proposal for a combined representation to the Spanish Govt., and I was disposed to believe that the recent departure of the President from Washington, on a visit to his Father, and which is to occupy him a month had probably prevented due discussion of this subject previously to his departure, but I observed Mr. King's letter was marked as received on the 15th. Sepr., and the President did not set out until the 21st. inst.

I have every reason to be satisfied with the unreserved manner in which Mr. Clay has communicated with me on this and other occasions, and using all due discretion and reserve with regard to the information which has been imparted to me, I shall take care to communicate to you whatever may transpire, about the decision of the Govt.

### IV. Vaughan to Ward.

Washington, Feb. 13, 1826.

I began my mission to the United States, under a conviction, that he British Govt. attached great importance to its relations with this country. A spirit of conciliation pervaded both Govts., altho' certain points of collision, such as the boundary line, the commercial intercourse with British Colonies and the indemnification for slaves under the St. Petersburgh convention still subsisted, they were in the course of arrangement by commissioners and negociations in London. It seemed therefore,

[1] See *Adams's Memoirs*, VII. 16.—Ed.

that a very important part of my functions here, in order to facilitate the adjustment of differences which were in negociation, was to conciliate the good humour, and cultivate the good feelings, which both Govts. were ready to assure me existed between them.

Now, I regret, that a jealousy should have been excited at Mexico, by Mr. Poinsett's conduct, which is at variance with the tenor of the declarations repeatedly made to me by this Govt., that the United States seek no exclusive privileges in Spanish America. That they will follow implicitly the open and avowed conduct of Gt. Britain in that respect.

You will perhaps say, that this may be their policy, in their commercial relations, but that they are seeking to make a general Federation of America, which is to exclude, in every possible shape, European connections, and that the United States seek to be placed at the head of that Federation, for the purpose of directing its operations and feelings, and that thereby in any future rupture between us, and the United States, a power is to be thrown into the scale of our enemy.

I confess that I look upon the new States of America, as of value, only, to the rest of the world, on account of the commerce to be carried on with them, and that I am not under the slightest apprehension of England being thrown overboard by Mexico, and the other States, or even by the United States, so long as raw produce must be exchanged for manufactures, so long as the New States require assistance in their great financial difficulties, and so long as they are so perfectly inadequate to their own defence against the enterprizes of European Powers, without the maritime friendship of England.

I confess that I do not fear that influence which the United States may seek to obtain, by placing themselves at the head of an American Confederation—I count upon the prejudices, the repugnance of all Spaniards to listen to strangers, upon their fanaticism, as safeguards against any overbearing influence of the United States until I find that they have entered into stipulations positively injurious to European Powers.

With regard to the encroachments in Texas, I learn from the Mexican Mission at Washington, that settlements from the United States were established in that Country at the solicitation of the Mexican Govt. It was lately stated in Congress here, that the Province of Texas had given away as much land as is contained in the United States territory of Arkansas, and that by those gifts a multitude of useful citizens had been enticed from this country. It was stated that more than 20,000 persons have left the Western States of this Govt. for the Province of Texas. It does not seem however that they amalgamated well with the old Spanish settlers, as it is their custom, whenever crime is to be punished, or disputes to be settled, to send for a judge to the neighbouring State of this Union.

The encroachments in Texas have arisen therefore rather from the imprudence of the Mexicans than the intrigues of Mr. Poinsett. There must always exist between the United States and Gt. Britain a certain rivalry in commerce and navigation, but I have been lately under a con-

viction, that our interests are compatible with each other, and inclined to contribute all in my power, to the extinguishing of our old animosities, and to the jointly profiting by the new commercial relations opened to us, by the independence of the Southern half of America.

It will be long before the New States can tempt us into a closer Political connection, than that arising out of commerce. Our connection with the United States is of a different character, and I should regret the possibility of your being obliged to act in opposition to Mr. Poinsett in Mexico, in a manner that should induce an impression at Washington that we are jealous of them in the New States. In my anxiety however to cement the Union between Gt. Britain and the United States, I should be anxious, in no shape to relax your vigilance in watching the conduct of the Agents of the latter at Mexico.

I am very anxious to know the nature of the Treaty which Morier and yourself negociated with the Americans, and also the nature of the Treaty[1] made by Mr. Poinsett, and which the Mexicans have lately rejected. The newspapers at Washington have told us, that one Article in the British Treaty conceded the point of Neutral flags, making neutral goods. The United States will be delighted at such a concession,[2] (which we have hitherto refused at so much loss of life and treasure), as I find that in discussions recently in Congress, it has been thrown out, as an argument for assisting at Panama, that that question might there be agitated, and the best effect might be produced by the New States of America insisting upon that condition in their treaties with other Powers.

I do not know how to reconcile the supposed anxiety of the United States to form a general Federation of America, with themselves at the head of it, with the backwardness and the opposition which has been manifested by both Houses of Congress, to accept the invitation to assist at the Congress at Panama. Colombia, Mexico and Guatemala invited the United States to send Representatives to Panama—The President accepted the invitation and named Messrs. Anderson and Sergeant to go there—That appointment requires the confirmation of the Senate, and immediately after the meeting of Congress, they were called upon to ratify the appointment. Up to this day they have not decided whether they will approve of the appointment or not. In the meantime the House of Representatives, have discussed the question upon the pretext of asking for papers respecting the invitation, and the result has been, a strong manifestation of dislike to the United States entering into what they call *entangling alliances*.

[1] Full particulars in *American State Papers, For. Rel.* folio edition, Vol. VI., pp. 578 ff. Poinsett was instructed to secure a treaty of limits and also a treaty of amity and commerce. The former treaty was made and adopted; the latter was not finally ratified by both parties.—Ed.

[2] "That free ships shall also give freedom to goods" was stipulated by Art. 16 of the Poinsett treaty which was finally not adopted. The same stipulation appears in the treaty of 1831, Article XV., 1, and in almost the same words. The treaty of 1831 was obtained by Butler, Poinsett's successor, but he seems to have profited by Poinsett's labors.—Ed.

Pardon me, my dear Ward, for writing you so long, so tiresome a letter, but you seemed to wish to have my opinion upon some points, and I am very anxious to encourage you to communicate with me in the very satisfactory and interesting manner, in which you have done lately— etc. etc. etc. (Signed) CHAS. R. VAUGHAN.

### V. VAUGHAN TO WARD.

WASHINGTON. 28. March 1826.

*My dear Ward,*

Since I last wrote to you I have been told by Mr. Obregon the Mexican Minister to the United States, that Morier has returned to Mexico, but I do not yet hear whether our Govt. has consented to rectify [ratify?] the commercial treaty which you conjointly made.

Some light has been thrown upon that Treaty during the discussion in the Congress of the United States, respecting the expediency of this Govt. accepting the invitation made to it by Colombia, Mexico and Guatemala to assist by Representatives at the Congress about to be held at Panama. I send you two newspapers which contain the correspondence between Mr. Clay and Mr. Poinsett, upon the subject of the latter having decided to reject any article in the Treaty between the United States and Mexico, of a nature similar to one said to have been inserted in the British Treaty with Mexico, granting the concession to the New States of special commercial privileges. You will see in the letter of Mr. Clay to Mr. Poinsett that this Govt. approves of the conduct of the latter.

These papers however have brought on a discussion in Congress, upon the subject of the pledge which Mr. Poinsett has undertaken to assert to the Mexican negociators, that the United States have given to bear the brunt of any contest which may arise out of the interference of any European Power in the independence or Government of the New States.[1] The House of Representatives disavows this pledge and declares that it knows of no other foundation for it, than a passage in the Message to Congress of Mr. Monroe Decr. 1823. In that message Mr. Monroe observed that any interposition by any European Power, for the purpose of oppressing or controlling the destiny of the States, whose in-

[1] Poinsett was instructed to repeat to Mexico the substance of the Monroe Doctrine. In a letter to Poinsett dated November 9, 1825, Clay said: "But when an attack is imagined to be menaced by Europe upon the independence of the United Mexican States, then an appeal is made to those fraternal sympathies which are justly supposed to belong to our condition as a member of the American family. No longer than about three months ago, when an invasion by France of the island of Cuba was believed at Mexico, the United Mexican Government promptly called upon the Government of the United States, through you, to fulfil the memorable pledge of the President of the United States in his message to Congress of December, 1823. What they would have done had the contingency happened, may be inferred from a dispatch to the American minister at Paris, a copy of which is herewith sent, which you are authorized to read to the plenipotentiaries of the United Mexican States." (*American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, Vol. VI., p. 583.)—ED.

dependence of Spain the United States had acknowledged could not be viewed in any other light than as "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

There is a wide difference as you will perceive, between the pledge asserted by Mr. Poinsett to have been given and the expression of the Ex-President Monroe. The Congress has required from the President, information, to know whether the executive Govt. has subsequently given instructions to Mr. Poinsett to hold out that the United States have given the pledge which he puts forward as an argument to induce the Mexicans to close with his terms for a commercial treaty. It is not doubted but that Mr. Poinsett has no other authority for his assertion than the message of President Monroe, which, I remember, made a strong impression in Europe couched even in his moderate language.

I think it right to put you in possession of what may be collected of the policy of this country with regard to Mexico and with the new States in general, by adding a newspaper copy of the instructions of Mr. Adams (now President) to Mr. Anderson when he was sent to Colombia.

The mission to Panama has met with considerable opposition in the Congress. The President accepted the invitation from Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia, but his nomination of Mr. Anderson (at present Minister to Colombia), and of Mr. Serjeant a Lawyer of Philadelphia, required the confirmation of the Senate. In that body a personal opposition to Mr. Adams exists, which has grown out of the past Presidential election. Much time has been lost in taking the subject into consideration—and great delay in bringing it to a decision. At length about the 15th. of March, the Senate decided to confirm the nominations made by the President by a majority of 24 to 19.

In the House of Representatives the subject is still under discussion, as they are required to make an appropriation for the expence of the mission. I am assured by Mr. Clay that the measure will certainly pass this House.

From the moment of the meeting of Congress in Decr. this question has been in agitation. The Plenipotentiaries cannot yet depart for Panama until the House of Representatives have voted the supply and they will not debate the question before Monday 3rd. of April. A dislike of meddling with the Congress at Panama at all, has been manifested in a considerable degree, and all this delay does not indicate the eagerness of the Nation in general to take their station, as the directing head of the new Republics, according to the principles of Mr. Poinsett.

We must not however allow ourselves to be lulled into a negligent observance of the conduct of the United States by their repeated declarations of equality and reciprocity in commercial regulations and their abhorrence of entering into alliances, which may "entangle and compromise" them—But at the same time I would inculcate great vigilance respecting their political movements in the new States, I apprehend that it is of great importance, not to risk the growing good-will between our respective Govts. by any exposure of jealousy on our part, of the attempts

of the Agents from the United States, to obtain the ascendancy at which they seem to aspire.

Depend upon it, that it will be but a fruitless effort on the part of these people to win the affections of so bigotted, so prejudiced, so ignorant a people as the descendants from Spain in America and that too, in opposition to all that they must owe to England for protection, for interchange of manufactures, for the produce of her mines which England alone can enable her to procure, let alone the impression of her power which the last contest in Spain against France must have left upon the new States.

With regard to your colleague Mr. Poinsett I must tell you that he enjoys a great reputation among the politicians of Washington and that there is very little disposition to doubt about his judgment.

I wrote you, not long since by New York, but I do not know whether a conveyance was found there for my letters. We are without news from England later than the 20 Janry. Many packets are due. The last intelligence received at New York, stated that Dawkins had been appointed to go to Panama. I am anxious to hear from him upon the subject. I think it is well that somebody should be sent to keep our Govt. acquainted with what is going on. We are told that the Deputies from Peru, Chili Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia are already assembled. The Commissioners from the United States will arrive in time, it is said, because the business will be confined at first to the Belligerents.

## VI. Ward to Canning.

Mexico. 7 April 1826.

*The Right Honle. George Canning,*
*Sir,*

It is with unfeigned satisfaction that I am, at length enabled to inform you that M Camacho's mission to England has been sanctioned in the Senate by a majority of 23 to 4.

The question was not brought on till this morning, and the decision was communicated to me almost at the same moment by a message from the Senate, and by an Aide de Camp of the President.

After the apprehensions expressed both by Mr. Morier and myself, with regard to the result of the discussion, you will probably be surprised at the manner in which it has terminated: But in a country where public opinion is not founded on any fixed principles and where the ignorance and suspicions of the leading men expose them to the attacks of those whose interest it often is to turn this want of fixed principles to account, you must not wonder at any fluctuations, however sudden, or however great the contradiction to which they must lead.

In the present instance I am bound to state my conviction that the Senate was *surprised* into the decision respecting the mission of M. Gomez Pedraza, without being at all aware of the consequences, with which that decision might have been attended.

The Government, from a foolish confidence in its own influence, took no steps to explain the real nature of the question, or to clear away that obscurity in which Mr. Poinsett had contrived to involve it; nor was it until General Victoria was roused into action by the disgrace of one failure, and the apprehension of a second, that any efforts were made on the part of the executive to carry a point of such vital importance to the Country.

It would be doing the President great injustice however, were I to refrain from stating, that, from the period of my conversation with him (of which I had the honor of giving you an account in my Dispatch No 22) up to the present moment his exertions have been as indefatigable as his inactivity in the first instance, was imprudent. To my knowledge, he has even gone so far as to declare, not to one but several Senators, that he would no longer remain at the head of affairs, if, upon such an occasion the honour, and plighted faith of the Government were to be again wantonly sacrificed.

I shall not attempt to explain, sir, the anomaly of such energetic language being held at one time, and such unaccountable apathy displayed at another. It is one of those contradictions peculiar to this country, which one must take advantage of, but which it is impossible to account for. Certain it is, however, that upon the present occasion it is to this change of conduct on the part of the President that we must attribute in a great measure the sort of revulsion which has taken place, in the feelings of the Senate with regard to Mr. Camacho.

I must confess likewise the utility of that delay which, in the first instance, I was inclined to regard as disadvantageous. By putting off the discussion time has been allowed for giving a wider circulation to those opinions which it was absolutely necessary to disseminate, and I have little doubt at present, that had the question been brought on a week ago, altho' it might have been carried, the result would not have been nearly so satisfactory.

Genl. Victoria has been seconded by men of all Parties: The arrival of Genl. Bravo[1] in the Capital, which took place about ten days ago, secured the co-operation of all his friends; all those who regard a connection with England as essential to the interests of this Country of course, sided with Government, and latterly, many, even of Mr. Poinsett's adherents, finding that there would certainly be a majority against them, endeavoured to make a merit with the President by offering him their votes.

Amongst them Mr. Zavala's name must not be omitted who, with that delightful inconsistency which I have so often had occasion to remark upon here, after doing everything in his power out of the Senate to get M Camacho's appointment thrown out, finished by speaking and voting

[1] Nicholás Bravo, a Mexican general of distinction. Chosen Vice-President in 1824. In 1828 he was at the head of a rebellion against the government demanding the acceptance of the plan of Montaño. He was unsuccessful. He was president for a short time in 1846.—Ed.

for him in the House. With General Bravo's frank and manly behaviour I have been much pleased; when I first spoke to him upon the subject of M. Camacho, soon after his return to the Capital, he told me fairly that he could not perceive what interest England could have in insisting upon the appointment of a Minister when there was evidently *so* strong an objection on the part of the Senate to allow any one holding a responsible official situation to leave the country. I explained in reply the misapprehension under which he laboured, and had no sooner convinced him, by shewing him the official correspondence (which, strange as it may appear, had not been communicated to him by the President), that our only anxiety was to enable the Government to redeem a pledge, which had been *voluntarily* given and not sought—much less insisted upon—by Gt. Britain, then he assured me that I might depend upon him, and upon the vote of every individual over whom he had the least influence; and such the event has proved to be the case.

With regard to the Senate, I must repeat, that it was *surprised* into its former decision.

I have naturally been thrown into very close communication with several members of that body during the last fortnight, and I have found them certainly labouring under a false impression, but by no means unwilling to allow that impression to be removed. Many were strongly prepossessed against M. Camacho's mission, not because they did not attach sufficient importance to the object of it, nor from any indifference as to the results, but simply because they had been taught to believe, by the American party, that M. Camacho was *not* the man to whom such a mission ought to be confided.

It required no little time or patience to convince men, thus schooled betimes, that they had been most grossly imposed upon, and that the persons who had shewn so much activity in endeavouring to mislead them were perfectly aware that unless M. Camacho were intrusted with the negociation, its failure would be inevitable. In effecting this, the letter which I had the honor of enclosing in my Dispatch No. 22 and of which several copies were put into circulation, was of some use; and though the language used in that letter, was certainly strong, I can hardly regret the circumstance which rendered that language necessary, for I am inclined to believe, that the lesson which the Senate has now received will be of use hereafter, by putting many well meaning men upon their guard against the designs of a party which, in the present instance had so nearly succeeded in involving them in a fatal contest with His M's Government.

For the line which I have myself taken in this discussion I shall make no apologies: Convinced that exertions were imperiously called for on our part when foreign influence was so openly exerted against us, and trusting that you would not disapprove of an interference, however direct, the object of which was, *not to influence the decision of a question purely Mexican*, but to neutralize the hostility of the party opposed to us, and thus to afford the Government and well-disposed portion of the Chambers of Mexico an opportunity of giving His M's. Government a

proof of their real sentiments; I have steadily adhered to the course which, in my Dispatch marked separate, and dated 18th. March, I stated it to be my intention to pursue. I have indeed, been forced to assume a higher tone than I then thought necessary but His M's. Commissioners by keeping in the background during the first discussion, had given their opponents an advantage which nothing but very decided measures could have deprived them of: I did not therefore scruple to run the risk even of widening the breach in the event of a second failure, in order to convince the Mexicans of the extreme importance of the point which they were about to discuss; and I threatened them with a positive rupture with Gt. Britain, as the best means of preventing that rupture from taking place. I am willing to confess however, that nothing but the success with which it has been attended, could warrant the expedient to which I resorted, and it is to your indulgence that I must look for my justification.

It now only remains for me to add that M. Comacho's health is completely restored and that he will take the very first opportunity which presents itself of proceeding to England.

It would be presumption in me to express even a wish with regard to the reception which His M's. Government may think proper to give to the proposals of which he is the bearer; but after the very signal defeat which the American party has sustained upon the present occasion, I should indeed be grieved if M. Camacho's mission were to terminate in a manner which would inevitably throw the game here once more into the hands of the United States.

I have the honor to be etc. etc. (signed) H. G. Ward.

### VII. Ward to Vaughan.

Mexico. 23 May. 1826.

*My dear Vaughan,*

I am very glad to have so early an opportunity of acknowledging your very interesting letter of the 28th. March.

The Packet by New York has not reached me, which I regret the more as I do not perceive by that now before me that you have received the copies of my correspondence with the Foreign Office, and other letters which I sent you as far back as the 28th. of last November, and which I should be sorry to think were lost.

It is true that you discuss the same subjects as those to which these letters alluded; but still they may have been brought before you merely by the publication of Mr. Poinsett's correspondence.

Under this impression I send you a duplicate copy of a Dispatch, which will give you a sufficient insight into the nature of the contest which I have had to sustain with Mr. Poinsett here. He has fought a hard battle, and is, as you justly describe him, a man of great talent, and, in every respect, a most formidable antagonist. Fortunately the United States have many vulnerable points. They have thwarted the

views of the Government with regard to the Island of Cuba, and the strong language of the President on this subject is not at all liked.

They have offended Mexican vanity by putting in a claim to be considered as the heads of the great American Federation.

In the North, they are bad neighbors, and have excited serious apprehensions with regard to Texas, by their systematic encroachments.

All these motives of dissatisfaction on the part of Mexico have been in my favour, and I do not hesitate to confess that without them I must have quitted the field.

With the best wishes to preserve that good understanding between our two Governments which you justly deem so important, I have been unable at times, to keep on very friendly terms with Mr. Poinsett. This was more particularly the case just after Morier's departure, when the question respecting Mr. Camacho's mission to England was still pending, and when we were almost involved in a personal quarrel. Since that great point was decided, things have gone on more smoothly, and we are now on very good terms.

I do not think that there is any immediate prospect of Mr. Poinsett's bringing his negotiation to a conclusion: Mr. Camacho who is a firm, and thoroughly honourable man, refuses, and I think with much reason, to sign a commercial Treaty, without coming to some explicit understanding respecting Boundaries, and insists upon an official Declaration, adopting the line fixed by the Treaty of lines and referring to a commission the correct geographical definition of that line.

Mr. Poinsett wishes to keep the whole question open, to make it a subject of a separate negotiation, and thus to afford time to the emigrants from the United States, who have already overrun a great part of Texas, to establish themselves there so firmly, that it will be impossible to expel them; in which case he probably hopes that a cession of right may be easily obtained.

Upon this point the Governments are at issue: Mr. Poinsett is procrastinating in the hope that when Mr. Camacho goes to England, he may succeed better with some other negotiator.

In this hope he will be disappointed; for the President has given a solemn promise to Mr. Camacho, that nothing shall be done during his absence, and that no Treaty shall be signed without him. I, therefore, feel but little apprehension with regard to the result, and have likewise the satisfaction of knowing, that, so far from obtaining any privilege or advantage over us Mr. Poinsett is forced to yield many of the points which we have virtually carried, trusting to the stipulation that the United States shall be regarded as the most favoured nation, for the attainment hereafter, of those concessions which he cannot now obtain.

Mr. Camacho's health is quite restored, and he is now only waiting for a proper conveyance which I am daily in expectation of being able to obtain for him.

A French general commercial agent (Mr. Martin) has recently arrived here; he met with anything but a favourable reception at first, and

it required no little labour to convince General Victoria, that even although his credentials were exceptionable, it would, at all events, be highly advantageous to Mexico to allow a man of respectability to reside here, in order to counteract those reports, which Spain so assiduously circulates with regard to the state of affairs in these countries. Intrigues could not long be carried on without being detected, and when detected might easily be cut short.

Mr. Martin appears to me a sensible and intelligent man, and nothing can be fairer than his professions: If he acts up to them he may be sure of my warmest support in every thing; for to induce the other powers of Europe to follow the example of Gt. Britain, is, I know, Mr. Canning's object, as it will be the best proof of the merits of his enlightened policy.

The United States need be under no apprehension with regard to the arrival of their Plenipotentiaries at Panama in time: The Mexican Plenries. M. M. Michelena and Dominguez have only just left Acapulco: They were to have sailed on board the Asia, but most fortunately for them, a plan was discovered on the part of the crew, to make amends for their treachery last year, by carrying the vessel into some Spanish port, where they thought that such a peace-offering as the Plenries. to Panama, would ensure them not only pardon, but rewards.

A law has just passed here abolishing all privileges and distinctions of Nobility.

Another, (of some importance) making it high treason to *propose* treating with Spain on any terms, but the unqualified recognition of the Independence, under the present form of Government, and subjecting to eight years imprisonment, any individual (whatever be his situation) who shall, either publicly or privately, bring forward a proposition on the part of the Spanish Government, or *any other in its name*, to grant to the Mother Country any species of indemnity, or compensation for the loss of her ancient supremacy—This will put an end to any idea of mediation on the part of Great Britain, tho' I had seen too much of the obstinacy of H. C. M. ever to think that Mr. Lamb's efforts on this subject would be of any avail.

I have now, I believe, told you all that has passed here of late: I shall therefore, conclude by hoping soon to hear from you again, and by assuring you that I shall ever remain,

My dear Vaughan,
Most Sincerely yours
H. G. Ward.

VIII. Ward to Vaughan.

Mexico. 10th. June 1826.

*My dear Vaughan,*

I have at last the pleasure of acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 13th. Feby., which has arrived from New York, just in time to enable me to thank you for it by the Courier whom I am about to dispatch this afternoon.

I need not tell you that I am most sincerely grateful to you for your advice, and honest opinion, nor will, I conceal from you the fact, that, had we been in communication sooner, and I had been assured by a person so well able to ascertain the truth, that Mr. Poinsett, in his plans here was not acting in concert with either the Govt. or the Congress at home, my opposition to him would have been conducted in a very different spirit.

But, I must in justice to myself observe, that it was impossible for me, or for any one here, to entertain a suspicion of the kind: who could suppose that a man of Mr. Poinsett's standing and high character in his own country, would expose himself to a disavowal like that which he has recently met with? Who could imagine that while taking a most decided line here, he reckoned upon no support at home?—Who think, that while speaking and acting in the name of his Govt., and moving Heaven and earth in order to establish his influence here upon the ruins of ours,—that Govt. would be proclaiming principles perfectly consistent with that spirit of fair competition, which it is neither the wish nor the interest of Gt. Britain to oppose?

I could only judge by facts which I had before my eyes, and those facts are more than sufficient to bear me out in the line which I have taken.

You must not, however, suppose, that while resisting, openly an open attack, it has been at all my wish to excite sentiments of rivality, or throw any obstacle in the way of those conciliatory views, which I knew to have been adopted by Govt. with the United States.

My line has been, from first to last, a defensive one; and so far from opposing Mr. Poinsett where his views do not clash with our interests, (for which I agree with you in thinking that there is no sort of necessity) he will find me ready and willing to assist him whenever I can.

His power to hurt is gone, his influence has been upon the decline ever since he failed so completely in the attempt to get Camacho's appointment thrown out, and the late proceedings at Washington have deprived him even of his most zealous partizans. Personally I have never disliked Mr. Poinsett, tho' there has been once or twice a sort of collision between us; but let him but meet me half way, and he will find me most ready to give up everything like opposition to him. But, I need dwell no further upon this subject: the inclosed copy of a Dispatch written just before your letter reached me, will shew you both the state of my feelings upon the subject, and those of the people here.

### IX. Ward to Vaughan.

Mexico. 27 Octr. 1826.

*My dear Vaughan,*

The three Dispatches of which I inclose copies, contain, a peu pres, all that I have to say, about the present state of affairs here, in as far as regards the points which are most likely to interest you.

Canedo's motion, (No 114) like many other good ideas in this country, has led to nothing; Esteva who is Grand Master of the New York Lodges, has stopped proceedings entirely, by not sending in the information which Gt. [government?] is requested to give, under the plea of not having yet been able to procure it from the States. In the meantime party quarrels are running higher than ever: The Press teems with libels, —and so many gross personalities have been published,—so many old Revolutionary stories brought to light, that if Spain were paying them to destroy their own credit as a Nation, they could hardly perform the task more effectually.

The contest for the Elections has carried this animosity into every corner of the Federation. You hear everywhere of Yorkinos, and Borbonistas, which term has, I think, been of late applied to almost every one who does not belong to the New York sect,—but more particularly to Genl. Bravo, and all his friends, whom it is the object of the Yorkinos to exclude, *at any price*, from power. They do not reflect that a party which comprises a very large portion of the wealth and talent of the country, will not patiently see itself hunted down by a set of needy and desperate adventurers—At least, they must not be driven to extremities, or I see that the next Election for the Presidency, will not be decided without an appeal to arms.

You can have no idea, My dear Vaughan, of the sort of men with whom the Yorkinos have sought to fill their ranks:[1] Half pay officers,— clerks in public offices, (particularly in those under Esteva's control)— petty advocates, clergymen who are reduced to seek, by an affectation of Liberal views, that promotion which their characters have prevented them from obtaining before. Such are the elements of which the New York Lodges are composed,—and, with a sprinkling of names which ought not, certainly, to appear amongst such associates. Such the party

[1] "Without any disparagement to its members, of whom many are both useful and distinguished men, I may say that the largest proportion of the Affiliés of this society consisted of the *novi homines* of the Revolution. They are the ultra-Federalists, or democrats of Mexico, and profess the most violent hostility to Spain, and to the Spanish residents . . ." H. G. Ward, *Mexico* (London: 1829), Vol. II., p. 408. With regard to Poinsett's influence in this matter see his defense in Niles's *Register*, Vol. XXXIII., pp. 23-26. He published in Mexico *Exposicion de la conducta politica de los Estados Unidos para con las nuevas repúblicas de America.* The congress of Vera Cruz declared that "he conceived a project the most disorganizing and terrible for the republic; which was nothing more nor less than the establishment of the *lodge of York Free Masons.*" Niles, *Ibid.*, p. 13.

An account is found in Ward's *Mexico*, Vol. II., pp. 407-408. Poinsett was instrumental in establishing York lodges of free masons. The Mexican masons had belonged in most cases to the Scotch rite. He says himself: "The rite of York existed before his arrival in this country. He found five lodges already established, and he done [sic] nothing more than send for charters for them from the grand lodge of New York, at their request to instal the grand lodge of Mexico." The "Yorkinos" and the "Escoceses" became rival political parties; the former the radicals and the latter the conservatives. Extreme bitterness and rancor characterized the relations between the parties and the accusations of each were in kind, though not in degree, very similar to those existing in this country in Washington's administration.—Ed.

which wishes to monopolize all Public Employments, and to form a New York Congress, in order to give the Country a New York President also!

Guerrero[1] and Esteva are both talked of for this dignity. Genl. Barragan likewise, who has been induced, very recently, to inscribe his name upon the New York lists, in the hope of obtaining it.

I do not, however, think that the party has yet as much influence as it imagines: The elections in the States have not gone in their favour at all generally, and where they have succeeded (as at Toluca), the law of elections has been so grossly violated, that it is probable that the elections themselves will be annulled.

In the meantime pecuniary difficulties are increasing in consequence of the embarrassments of the house of Barclay and of the wise resolution of our merchants not to send another vessel here, until the present absurd system of duties is modified. In short, things are decidedly in a bad state, and had Mexico an enemy of even common activity, the consequences might be more serious than I have ever hitherto imagined.

I regret this the more because of the extent to which British capital is embarked here—Our companies require nothing now but tranquillity, and their success cannot be doubtful.

I am going to undertake a journey on the 1st. to Guanajuato and Zacatecas: here I can do no good, at present, and I believe that if my interference be required later, it will be the more effectual from my being known to be connected with neither of the great parties of the day. Poinsett has certainly done himself no good; by following a different line: He has all the odium of having created the sect which has given rise to those fatal Divisions by which the country is now torn to pieces, while Esteva has completely supplanted him in the management of its affairs.

### X. Pakenham to Vaughan.

Octr. 18/27.

I have already been once robbed and narrowly escaped being murdered at Noonday within pistol shot of the gate of the town; there is not such a cut-throat country I am sure in the world. Our house is opposite to a sort of half prison, half hospital, where the killed and wounded are deposited after every affray. Five minutes don't pass without our seeing a wounded or a dead man *carried* in there.

### XI. Pakenham to Vaughan.

Mexico. Sepr. 24. 1828.

*My dear Vaughan,*

The last letter I received from you was dated the 28th. May. I now proceed to answer it by the New York Packet which promises to sail from Vera Cruz on the 1st. of next month. Since I last wrote

[1] Vicente Guerrero suppressed the Bravo or Montaño rebellion of 1828; candidate for the presidency, 1828; defeated by Pedraza in the election. Rebellion ensued and Guerrero became President in 1829.—Ed.

to you the question which has exclusively occupied everybodys attention has been the election of the President who is to enter on his office early next year. The States voted on the 1st. of Sepr. and the result has been a majority of two in favor Genl. Gomez Pedraza—the present minister of War—. You are already aware that the Yorkino party has been for the last 3 years moving Heaven and earth to secure the election of Guerrero—Their defeat, constitutionally speaking, is therefore complete,—but they are not the sort of fellows to acquiesce peacably in an arrangement which has no stronger foundation than a paper constitution to which they have all sworn. They have now taken up arms, and seem determined right or wrong to set aside the election of Pedraza and place Guerrero at the head of the Govt.

The appearance of things is truly alarming—The insurrection began at Xalapa in the first week of this month—where a General Santa Anna, a character who has successively served and betrayed every party which has figured in this country since the beginning of the revolutionary war, headed a tumultuous meeting that was held for the purpose of intimidating the legislature of that State, Vera Cruz, to rescind the vote it had given for Pedraza, and vote for Guerrero—the Congress had firmness enough to resist, and to suspend Santa Anna from his functions of V. Gov. of the State, accusing him of Sedition and directing the military commandant to place him under arrest.

To this Santa Anna submitted for three days,—when having matured his plans, he started from Xalapa with 300 men of the garrison whom he had seduced from their duty, and took possession of the castle of Perote, a fortress which commands the principal road from the Capital to the coast,—where he has collected a force of about 1000 men, consisting of deserters from Xalapa and Puebla, and mounted peasantry, a description of force which is very efficient in the sort of desultory warfare which he will probably endeavour to carry on. The Govt. are taking for this country very energetic measures to suppress this insurrection, and the Congress luckily are cordially seconding this effort. A great reaction has certainly taken place in the public feeling since January last, when it seemed all over with the 'Esoces' interest, had the Govt. then had occasion to apply to the Congress for any laws, which would have been contrary to the views of the Yorkino's, hardly a member of either character would have been found to vote for them,—now several measures aimed not only at Santa Anna and his followers but at the whole Yorkino system have been passed rapidly and without much discussion—1st. a law putting Santa Anna and his companions [to death] if within a certain time they do not lay down their arms—those who do will have their lives spared but they will undergo any other punishment which a military tribunal may think proper to sentence them to—2nd. a law for the better punishment of abuses of the liberty of the press—under the old law such offences being tried before a committee of the municipality, blasphemously called a "Jury," composed entirely of Yorkino's, condemned without mercy any publications contrary to their views, while any attack however

libellous or infamous against the opposite party enjoyed perfect impunity. You can have no idea of the atrocious and barefaced partiality with which the late law was administered,—There will be under the new one some chance of fair play. 3rdly. extraordinary powers, something like our suspension of the habeas Corpus act, have been voted to the President, which will enable the Governt. to lay hold of the instigators of the mischief,—a measure which is likely to have the best effects. 4th. notice has been given for a motion for the suppression of Secret societies,—this is striking at the very root of the evil, and I sincerely hope it may be passed.

You must not be surprised to hear soon that Mr. Poinsett has been invited to walk off,—but I rather think that he is too cunning to let things come to that, and that in a few weeks we shall have the satisfaction of seeing him depart of his own accord.[1]

Now to return to Santa Anna,—you will find his plan detailed in the No. of the Sol which I enclose,—to talk of annulling an election made by the Legislative bodies, is imprudent enough but to say that they shall proceed to elect such a particular person, is the greatest burlesque upon the elective system that has yet been brought before the public.

You will see that he has made use of the popular cry against the old Spaniards,—this will I think get him more recruits than the rest of his professed objects not excepting that of the forced election of Guerrero.

The greatest danger the Govt. have to fear is the instability of the troops, and the greatest precaution is required to be used in order not to increase the strength of Santa Anna by the defection of the soldiers sent against him. I do not however despair of the ultimate result, tho' I fear that untill the interval which the Constitution most unaccountably interposes between the election and installation of the new President as Governor, we shall not have many quiet moments.

"*Gritos*" will of course, take place in other parts of the country—but Santa Anna's is probably the worst we shall have to encounter.

[1] The plan of Montaño issued by the Escoceses or Novenarios at the end of 1827 embraces four articles: suppression of secret societies; dismissal of the cabinet; dismissal of Poinsett; scrupulous enforcement of the laws. See the document in Ward's *Mexico*, Vol. II., p. 565.—Ed.

## DOCUMENTS

### *The Papers of Sir Charles R. Vaughan*, 1825–1835.

(*Concluding Installment.*)

VAUGHAN'S arrival in America almost coincided with the opening of the dispute concerning the northeastern boundary.[1] Those who are familiar with the difficulties about boundaries which fill so large a place in the colonial history of the eighteenth century know that in most cases the question became acute, not through any formal assertion of a claim by a colonial government but through the refusal of individual citizens to accept the jurisdiction of the colony which claimed their allegiance, on the plea that they were outside its boundaries. So it was in this case. The treaty of 1783 had arrived at a supposed solution of the boundary question which was in reality no solution.' Owing to the lack of local knowledge and a proper survey, terms were used to define the boundary which were in reality unmeaning. But the zone of country affected, the debatable land as one may call it, remained unoccupied and the difficulty therefore unheeded down till about 1825. Then as it would seem, individual settlers from Maine began to dispute the authority of the New Brunswick government surveyors. American land agents too were impressing on the settlers that they must get titles for their holdings from the governments of Maine or Massachusetts, as the case might be. In March, 1827, we find Vaughan telling Canning in a despatch that Clay has promised to restrain the governors of Maine and Massachusetts from any encroachments on the territory in dispute. That this was not without effect is clearly shown by a proclamation dated September 5, 1827, which is among the Vaughan papers, by which the governor of Maine tells certain citizens to abstain from any independent action of the nature of encroachment and if they are wronged to trust to their government to obtain redress. Yet it is clear from the correspondence between Vaughan and the governor of New Brunswick, Sir Howard Douglas, that encroachments still went on and that timber-cutting and occupation were taking place on the territory in dispute.

Vaughan at once saw that the present loss or inconvenience was a small part of the matter. The real danger was that the Amer-

[1] The comments on the letters that follow are by Mr. John A. Doyle, who wrote the introduction to the documents with a sketch of Vaughan's early career.—ED.

icans might secure a frontier so near the St. Lawrence as to be a source of danger in time to come. One of his letters to Douglas clearly shows that he had grasped the temper of New England. "I find I have a tough, tenacious people to deal with here, which requires great firmness and above all great temper in those who have to deal with them." Vaughan's letters too show that he was quickly beginning to understand the *arcana imperii* of the United States. The Federal government is anxious to be just and even conciliatory but it lacks firmness in dealing with its constituent members. Even Jackson strong-willed as he is and well-disposed to England cannot forget that he will be a candidate for re-election and must consider the vote of Maine. And at a somewhat later stage of the dispute Vaughan writes that Jackson is showing "not the force . . . . of his own character, but the temporizing character of Van Buren." He adds that "The United States Government is always timid when it apprehends collision with any State." And in the same strain he writes to Palmerston in April, 1831, "Whenever the executive part of this government is by accident in collision with the government of a State the policy of the former is generally of a feeble and temporizing character." Yet Jackson in his message of 1830 says that "the negotiations have been characterized by the most frank and friendly spirit on the part of Great Britain and concluded in a manner strongly indicative of a sincere desire to cultivate the best relations with the United States." It is clear enough what was Jackson's attitude in this dispute. He was anxious to avoid collision and willing to do much for that end. Yet he could not afford openly and definitely to tell Maine and Massachusetts that the Federal government would not support their claim.

In 1827 it seemed as if a solution had been found. The question was referred to the King of the Netherlands as arbitrator. His award was issued in 1831. Unfortunately it took a form which rendered it open to dispute. He admitted that no exact boundary as set forth in the terms of the treaty of 1783 could be found. But he recommended the two governments to accept a boundary which equitably represented the intentions of the treaty of 1781. The American government declined to accept this on the plea that the reference to the arbitrator simply authorized him to interpret the treaty and that it was beyond his authority to recommend a compromise. Maine furthermore refused to accept the arbitration on the curious plea that the King of the Netherlands was no longer in the same position as when appointed as he had lost three-fifths of his subjects by the separation of Belgium and was now dependent on the good-will of Great Britain.

The further course of the dispute may be best learned from the following papers :

XII. CHARLES R. VAUGHAN TO THE EARL OF ABERDEEN.

WASHINGTON. 12. Octr. 1830.

*My Lord*,—I received on the 12 Augst. a letter (a copy of which I have the honor to inclose), dated the 5th. July, from Mr. Black, who in the absence of His Majesty's Lt. Governor of New Brunswick, Sir Howard Douglas, administers the Govt. of the Province. Mr. Black informed me in this letter, that the marshal of a district, in the State of Maine, had sent a deputy into the territory in dispute between his Majesty and the United States, with instructions to take a census of the population, as though the inhabitants belonged decidedly to the United States.

It appears by the copy of the instructions, inclosed in Mr. Black's letter, given by the Marshal of Maine to his Deputy Genl. Webber, that the census was to be taken in that part of the county of Penobscot called the Madawaska Settlements and also in all the settlements upon the Aroostook river. General Webber was ordered to desist from taking a census by a magistrate acting under the Government of New Brunswick, and he readily complied with his orders, and retired from the disputed territory. As the General Government has not in any shape notified this proceeding to me, from whence I infer, that they acquiesce in the right of the British authorities to require the agent from Maine to desist from taking a census, I have not thought it necessary to demand of this Government a formal disavowal of such conduct.

Ever since the election of General Jackson to be President of the United States, the complaints on the part of the Government of the State of Maine of the encroachments by British authority, upon the disputed territory, which were so frequent under the preceding administration, have been discouraged, and have ceased. I trust therefore that your Lordship will approve of my having declined to renew the discussion of jurisdiction in the disputed territory, while I have expressed to Mr. Black in a letter a copy of which is inclosed, my readiness at all times to meet the wishes of the Government of New Brunswick, and the satisfaction which I derived, from the proper and successful resistance of the magistrates to the intrusion of General Webber.

XIII. CHARLES R. VAUGHAN TO VISCOUNT PALMERSTON.

LONDON

30 July 1832

*My Lord*. . . . Certainly no people live under a form of Government which offers so many difficulties and uncertainties, in negotiations with Foreign Governments, as the United States. The examples are not unfrequent, of Treaties being rejected by the Senate, which have been concluded after long and tiresome negotiations by Plenipotentiaries appointed by the Executive.

As I have already stated the final settlement of the boundary question is not of importance to the Americans, but in my opinion it is of urgent necessity, on the part of Great Britain, if we wish to preserve undisturbed our relations with the United States. The moment that the rejection of the decision of the arbitrator is decided upon by the United States, the Province of New Brunswick must be placed in a safe defensive state by the arming of the Militia and the Governor will, as before the Arbitration, be in a constant state of collision with the State of Maine about encroachments and disobedience of the Americans settled in and near the Province, and about the exercise of jurisdiction over the disputed territory, which clearly belongs to England, until that portion of New Brunswick which is yet in abeyance between the two Governments, shall have been finally set off and separated by a settlement of the boundary.

One essential point in that settlement is a secure communication between the Province of New Brunswick and Lower Canada, which I have been given to understand might without difficulty be preserved, should we be obliged to abandon the Post Route hitherto used through the disputed Territory, by a very easy and practicable line, entirely through British Territory.

### XIV. Charles R. Vaughan to Viscount Goderich.

London

7th Feb. 1833

*My Lord.* . . . In addition to the above motives for not hastily closing with this offer to negotiate, a new pretension by command of the Senate has been inseparably attached to it, namely, a right to the navigation of the river St John. To concede this right would place the British subjects in New Brunswick in competition in their valuable Timber Trade, with the Americans, who would find an outlet for the timber from the vast Forests of Maine by that River, the military defences of New Brunswick on the Frontier of the United States would be turned, and the concession of the principal must open to the Americans the Navigations of the St Lawrence.

I consider the last clause in the offer to negotiate, as the probable motive for the rejection of the decision of the King of the Netherlands. The navigation of the St John's has long been an object of great importance with the people of Maine. The facility with which the Americans put forward a pretention, and the pertinacity with which they will insist upon it, makes one inclined, at once, in such a case as the navigation of the St John's to insist upon its being withdrawn as connected with the settlement of the Boundary as it involves interests which require consideration.

It is my opinion that the sooner this pretention is rejected the better, for so long as there is a chance of Great Britain admitting it to be a question fit for negotiation, in combination with the Settlement of the

Boundary, there is no chance of the Senate in some future Session reversing and revoking their rejection of the Boundary line suggested by the King of the Netherlands.

There was a minority of 8 to 34 who voted for accepting that line. The President and his ministers were disposed to acquiesce and I cannot but feel inclined to believe that when the pretention to navigate the St John's is decidedly rejected, that the Americans will be convinced that they are putting themselves into the wrong, by not acquiescing, as Great Britain has done, in the decision of the King of the Netherlands. I take it for granted that H.M. Government are not inclined to retract their declaration of declaration of willingness to agree to that line of Boundary.

I submit these observations to H.M. Government, as I conceive that the time is arrived when an answer must be given to the offer of the President to negotiate and the rejection of the Navigation of the St John's might be declared in any note which the British Government might think it right to send to the Government of the United States, should it be thought expedient formally and officially to demand further explanation before it can decide upon the expediency of entering in-to a negotiation.

In my opinion, the best termination of the Boundary question, would be that the Government of the United States should reconsider and acquiesce in the Boundary proposed by the King of the Netherlands. Should they ultimately consent to do so, it might afterwards be worth while to remove them by negotiation from the St Francis River, and from the Northern side of the St John's by some equivalent elsewhere.

There are certain difficulties attending all negotiations with the United States, peculiar to their Constitution of Government, which ought to induce a reluctance in Foreign Powers hastily to embark in negotiations with them. I allude to the subserviency of the Executive to the dictates and interests of the State to be principally affected by the result, and to the share or participation which the Senate has in making Treaties.

A negotiation at Washington for adjusting the Boundary, would be in fact a negotiation with the State of Maine carried on through the medium of the Executive. The President Jackson having now secured his re-election for the second term of four years, might be less inclined to attend to all the interested views of Maine, than during the last summer, but any Treaty concluded by Plenipotentiaries, and with his perfect approval, must be submitted to the Senate for their confirmation before it can be offered for ratification. The Senate has repeatedly undertaken to discuss a Treaty, as though it had not been framed by persons authorized to make it, and to alter it at their pleasure and even to reject it.

A treaty upon the Boundary would be submitted to a Senate composed of two thirds of the members, who have already prejudged the British claims, and decided in favour of the claims of Maine, when they rejected the line of Boundary proposed by the King of the Netherlands.

I venture to submit to your Lordship's consideration, the expediency of making a stand upon the decision of the King of the Netherlands in hopes that when the pretention to navigate the St John's is positively refused to be considered as a part of the Boundary Question, the Senate may revise and revoke its resolution of July last.

I could not, without far exceeding the space at my disposal, trace the complex disputes arising out of the commercial relations between the United States and Great Britain. If Vaughan's American informants are to be believed, that dispute would in all likelihood never have arisen, or never at least become acute, but for the self-will and lack of candor of John Quincy Adams. Vaughan gives an account of a remarkable conversation that he had with Tazewell [1] of Virginia. According to Tazewell, when Adams was intrusted with the negotiations with Lord Castlereagh, he refused certain commercial concessions which would have obviated all future difficulty on the ground that they were dogged by conditions which would give the British government influence over the Indians on the American frontier. Castlereagh offered to revise these conditions in whatever manner Adams would suggest. "Mr Tazewell," Vaughan goes on to say, "assured me that he could never forgive Mr Adams for sending to his Government the proposals of Lord Castlereagh accompanied by a despatch containing his suspicions without one word of the frank disavowal of Lord Castlereagh. Had Mr Adams recommended the acceptance of these proposals, it has been observed in a newspaper (New York Evening Post, October 6, 1830) 'twelve years legislative war would have been avoided, and a commerce secured to the United States more valuable than with any other country than Great Britain.'"

To this Vaughan appends a marginal note "A committee of the House pronounced these proposals to be the most rational and reciprocally advantageous ever proposed."

Vaughan's arrival in America coincided with the conflict on the question of trade assuming an acute form. Up to 1825 the only measures of the nature of protection and exclusion had been on the side of America. The natural conditions of West Indian trade were that British vessels could load with West Indian produce and transport it to the ports of the United States on cheaper and easier terms than American vessels could. This, as a natural consequence by handicapping American vessels on their return voyage, tended to withdraw them altogether from the West Indian trade. Moreover, although the British government did not exclude American goods

[1] Littleton W. Tazewell, 1774–1860; Senator from Virginia, 1825–1833; for some time chairman of committee on foreign relations.—Ed.

and American vessels from its colonial ports collectively, yet it did in individual cases. By custom house regulations certain ports were thrown open to certain goods. And it was alleged that this was so arranged that American vessels were, not excluded, but deterred from attending those ports from which the return voyage was most lucrative. To meet these restraints the American government imposed heavy differentiating duties depriving British vessels of their advantage. An act of Parliament in 1825 authorized the King by an order in council to close the British colonial ports to American vessels until the discriminating duties were withdrawn.

The conflict of views in the United States was not merely a question of local division. The tariff pressed with varying force on different victims of the industrial community. This is clearly pointed out in an extract from an American paper preserved by Vaughan. Producers of protected goods were not the only people who benefited by the tariff. Small importers gained because they were allowed credit for their duties and were thus mutually enabled to borrow capital. Common brokers gained because they charged their commission on the "long price" as it was called, that is the price paid by the importer after duty had been levied.

Vaughan's letters during 1826 and 1827 throw frequent light on the course of the dispute.[1] On the 2d of October, 1826, he reports a preliminary skirmish with Clay. The latter expressed surprise at the Act of 1825 being passed without any attempt at negotiation. Vaughan replied that the British government had given full notice of its intention, and that since then there had been nothing in the action of Congress to suggest any change of purpose.

In February, 1827, Vaughan wrote hopefully to Sir Howard Douglas the governor of New Brunswick. The United States government was, he thought, ready to meet Great Britain half way. If the British government would relax their protective system, America would, he believes, open her ports to British vessels and abolish the differentiating duties. Moreover the United States government would not demand that American produce imported into the West Indies should be put on the same footing as that coming from British colonies in North America.

Vaughan saw too that in this matter the government of the United States was not wholly in touch with public opinion. "With regard to the impression made upon the public as it is to be collected from newspapers there is less expression of angry feeling

[1] Gallatin was appointed minister to succeed King and to reach aggreement with England on various controversies. Gallatin's letters on this subject are gathered in Adams's *Writings of Albert Gallatin*, Vol. II. Correspondence between Vaughan and Clay can be found in *Am. St. Papers, For. Rel.*, VI. pp. 257–259; 985.—Ed.

than is usual on such occasions and rather a regret manifested that the Government should not have avoided by its measures the loss of a very lucrative trade."

Ten days later Vaughan reports a conversation with Clay.

"Mr Clay has been in communication with the President who is still absent from Washington, upon the subject of the order in Council and I learn from him that when that order shall be carried into effect, it will in all probability be followed by a suspension on the part of the United States, of all intercourse, with our West Indian Islands, and with British North American Colonies. Upon my observing that according to my reading of the order in Council, the last-mentioned Colonies were exempted from the provisions of that order, he immediately replied that the Government of the United States could not fail to perceive in that exemption, a plan for making the British North American Colonies the deposits of American produce, to be carried afterwards from thence to the West Indies.

"Mr Clay seemed to think that there would be great difficulty in placing the trade between the United States and the British Colonies upon a fair footing of reciprocity and equality. He informed me, however, that after diligent enquiry he had convinced himself, that the claim was untenable which had been put forth by the United States, to have the produce of this country received in the British West Indian ports upon the same terms as the produce of British North American Colonies, of a similar description. It appears that the President, who always insisted upon this claim, has been persuaded by Mr Clay to abandon it and that Mr Gallatin is instructed to give up the point in his negotiations in London."

On the 30th of October Vaughan writes to Canning inclosing a newspaper article which he regards as inspired by the American government. Vaughan describes it as a labored justification of the government for not having abolished the discriminating duties. The noteworthy feature of the article is that it is not a defence of the protective system in itself. The writer only pleads on behalf of the government that the British government is not showing any inclination to meet the United States half way. The refusal on the part of the Senate to abolish the discriminating duties is justified upon the expediency of awaiting the result of negotiating to which it was necessary to resort, in order to settle a trade which had been the subject of controversy for thirty years and which would, otherwise, be still dependent upon acts of Parliament, upon orders in council and liable to such duties as the colonial legislatures might think proper to impose, from a view of their own insulated interests. In proof of the latter, notice is taken of an act of the legislature of Nova Scotia, imposing new duties upon articles imported from foreign countries, eight months after the acts of Parliament of 1825 were published.

In this article it is stated, that a power was left with the President of the United States to suspend the discriminating duties when-

ever satisfactory proof was given to him that like terms had been granted to American commerce and navigation in British colonial ports. This assertion is calculated to mislead the public, inasmuch as the *like terms* insisted upon included a relaxation of the whole colonial system of Great Britain, and when it was proposed to give that power to the President for the abolition of the discriminating duties imposed upon British vessels in American ports from British colonies, during the last session of Congress, the motion was dropped in the House of Representatives without any definite decision.

This article concludes with expressing a hope, that mutual concessions being made, the question "may come to an acceptable issue, at no distant period and if practicable before that prescribed for the recent sweeping order in Council to take effect shall have arrived; an order issued at nearly the very moment of the landing of a new minister from the United States, without his having an opportunity to hold a single conference with regard to it."

Upon the article Vaughan makes the following comment:

"This is not exactly correct, as I understand that Mr Gallatin had an audience with you, previously to the issue of the order in Council.[1]

"With regard to the hope expressed in this article, I shall attend to the instructions which I have had the honor to receive from you contained in your Despatch No. 24, and I shall carefully abstain from giving any expectation that anything which Mr Gallatin can now bring forward will alter the determination of His Majesty's Government.

"The article which I have enclosed, taken from a newspaper published at New York, contains a refutation of the arguments brought forward in a Report of the Committee of Commerce against the abolition of the discriminating duties, made during the last Session of Congress, and points out many errors into which the Chairman of that Committee had fallen when treating of the British regulations of Foreign intercourse with the Colonies."

The matter was complicated by the existence of a trade between the West Indies and the British dependencies north of the United States, Canada and New Brunswick. It was possible for American vessels starting from their own ports to appropriate a portion of the carrying trade between these British colonies. This was facilitated by the fact that for a portion of the year the St. Lawrence was unnavigable. At such times the only outlet or inlet for Canadian exports and imports was by land and through the United States. It was, however, a fixed principle even with those who, like Huskisson, were for encouraging intercourse within certain limits between the United States and the West Indies that such intercourse should

[1] The order in Council is in fact dated July 27. Gallatin reached London August 7. Gallatin had not seen the order on his first interview with Canning, August 17. *Am. St. Papers, For. Rel.*, VI. 249, 346.—Ed.

not encroach on the trade between British dependencies. That was as much an internal trade, a legitimate national monopoly, as the trade between London and Newcastle. Again if the Americans limited their retaliation simply to vessels coming from the West India ports where the duties of which they complained were levied, then in all likelihood vessels from Canada and New Brunswick having free intercourse on the one hand with the United States and on the other with the West Indies, would get the carrying trade into their own hands. Clay's views on this latter point are referred to twice in Vaughan's letters.

On December 5, 1826, Vaughan writes:

"Mr Clay is under a conviction that the ports of the United States shall be closed to British vessels proceeding from British Colonies in which the late order in Council should be carried into effect, but that all intercourse shall likewise be prohibited with the British North American Colonies exempted from the operation of that order.

"Upon my observing to Mr Clay that in that case the new measure recommended to the adoption of the Congress went far beyond the retaliation provided for and marked out by the Act of 1823, Mr Clay justified the extent to be given to the provisions of a new act upon the grounds that the British North American Colonies could not be permitted to profit by the interruption of the intercourse between the United States and the West Indies."

And again on December 20th.

"I apprehend from my conversations with Mr Clay, that the Congress will direct all intercourse with British Colonies by vessels of any nation to be strictly prohibited.[1] Mr Clay observes to me, that to shut the ports of the United States to British vessels proceeding from British Colonial ports only, from whence vessels of the United States are excluded, is objectionable, as thereby the carrying of produce of the United States to the West Indies would be thrown into the hands of the inhabitants of the British North American Colonies. To shut the ports of the United States to all British vessels from all British colonies indiscriminately would throw the carrying trade between the United States and the West Indies into the hands of the Danes and other powers. There is therefore the only alternative left of preventing all intercourse with the West Indies."

What follows is more hopeful.

"There is certainly a disposition in the Congress to call the Government to account for having allowed the intercourse with the Colonies to be in the state in which it now is, and this question has been discussed in the newspapers and in society with more temper and moderation than I could have expected.

"Mr Clay continues to repeat to me the complaint of this Government that the bar to further negotiation respecting Colonial intercourse was sudden and unexpected, particularly as they had been informed in the month of March last, that His Majesty's Government was preparing

[1] Such a proclamation was issued March 17, 1827. *Am. St. Pap., For. Rel.*, VI. 985; *State Papers*, 1st Sess. 20th Cong., Vol. I., Doc. 2. p. 36.—Ed.

to resume the suspended negotiations, of which the Colonial trade was a part.

"In answer to this, I have reminded Mr Clay of the remarkable forbearance shewn during the last year by the British Government. The Acts of Parliament in question were passed in the month of July 1825, and were to have been carried into effect in the month of January 1826. But they were allowed to remain inoperative so far as regarded the United States, until the late order in Council fixed upon the 1st of December of this year for that purpose.

"Mr Clay has complained to me that these Acts were not communicated officially to his Government, upon which I observed that I never heard that it was the usage of nations to communicate to foreign Governments their legislative enactments for the better governing of their States; that I did not understand that any official communication of these Acts of Parliament had taken place to any other of the foreign countries, equally interested in their operation as the United States. It could not however be alleged, that this Government remained in ignorance of those Acts, as I reminded Mr Clay, that it was in the month of December 1825, that on the occasion of a discussion in Congress relative to the threatened closure of the port of Halifax, he sent his copies of the Acts to the Congress, when they were ordered to be reprinted for the use of members.

"The forebearance of the British Government continued throughout the Session of Congress, during which the abolition of the American discriminating duties was discussed, as the removal of them was felt to be absolutely necessary, before the United States could participate in the British Colonial trade under the new acts.

"I have reminded Mr Clay that the long forbearance of the British Government had been met by a resolution of Congress to leave the abolition of discriminating duties to be a subject of negotiation in London, which it was clear it could not be after the measure of opening the trade to the Colonies generally to all the world had been fixed by an Act of Parliament.

"In answer to this, Mr Clay has observed to me that he had now discovered that if the Congress had abolished the discriminating duties, they would have legislated in the dark. That it was now asserted that the United States could not come within the conditions of the Act of 1825 unless the Act of Congress also was repealed which restricted British vessels from clearing out in ports of the United States for the British West Indies, unless they had proceeded in the first instance to the American port from a British Colony.

"Mr Clay has also stated to me another objection to the conditions of the Act of 1825. The United States have great difficulty in consenting to treat British vessels, as the vessels of the most favoured nation, because by the engagements of the United States with Sweden and with other countries, it is mutually agreed that the vessels of either nation shall be at liberty to carry to the ports of the other the produce of any country.

"The British Navigation Act, Mr Clay observes, would prevent any reciprocity between Great Britain and the United States, which should give a similar lattitude with regard to the produce which their vessels might import.

"With regard to the abolition of the discriminating duties, I ought to inform you that during that discussion in the last Session of Congress, I

gave Mr Clay to understand confidentially that Great Britain would, whenever the American duties were abolished, abolish the equivalent duty which had been imposed on American shipping in British Colonies."

The following letters illustrating the complexity of the situation, hardly admit of an epitome.

### XV. Charles R. Vaughan to George Canning.

Washington

Feb. 28th 1827

*Mr Canning.*

*Sir,* The Act, which the Committees of Congress proposed to pass in consequence of His Majesty's order in Council, closing the Ports of the West India Islands to vessels of the United States, has at length been taken into consideration in one of the Houses of Congress, the Senate.

On Feb 21st the passing of the Act was called for by Mr Johnston, the Chairman of the Committee, and General Smith opposed the Bill, and offered an amendment. The purport of it was to open the ports of the United States, from and after the 31st December next to all vessels from ports of British Colonies which are already established or may be established hereafter as free ports, upon paying the same duties as upon cargoes in American vessels—and to suspend until the 31st December the Acts of Congress of March 1823—May 1820, and April 1818, excepting so much as imposes discriminating duties on the tonnage of Foreign Vessels and their cargoes.

General Smith recommended the adoption of his amendment, as being of a more conciliatory character, than the Act proposed in its present shape, which in his opinion implied a menace in the event of the British Government not agreeing to change its policy.

This amendment was favourably received by the Senate and ordered to be printed.

On the following day Mr Holmes a Senator from the State of Maine, moved to substitute for the amendment proposed by General Smith, one, which should declare, that the Act proposed by the Committees of Commerce, should be in force, unless the President should receive information before the 1st of August, that the British Colonial Ports were open to vessels of the United States—and that discriminating Duties on British Vessels and Cargoes should cease.

This amendment of Mr Holmes was rejected by 32 Votes to 13.

On the following day the 23rd February, the debate upon the Colonial Act was resumed by Mr Johnston, who replied to General Smith and supported the act brought forward by him as Chairman of the Committee. He was followed by Mr Holmes, who moved an amendment, the object of which was, to interdict the trade with the British Colonies, both by land as well as sea, as he beleived that so long as the trade through the Canadas should remain open, the object of the Bill

would not be obtained, which was, the coercion of Great Britain into the measures sought by the United States.

This amendment was opposed by Mr Sandford of New York, who considered the Bill under discussion, as very distinct from a commercial enactment, and to be considered as a Navigation Act, the object of which was to touch the Navigating interests of Great Britain, rather than to regulate the internal trade with the Canadas, through which very little flour was sent from the United States to the British West Indies.

Mr Holmes while supporting his amendment, confessed the injury which the measure he had proposed would do to the interests of the State of New York, and that the State of Maine which he represented would likewise be injured by it: as the act once passed, passed in the form proposed by the committee, the port of Eastport in Maine must become a depôt for the produce of the United States, to be conveyed thence to the British Colonies by the Island of Campo Bello (within two miles of it) which would be declared immediately a Free Port.

Mr Tazwell, who generally opposes the measures of the Government, spoke in favour of Mr Holmes proposal, to close the intercourse with the Canadas by land. He felt the injustice of leaving a trade, to be carried on by the State of New York and the Eastern States, which was to be entirely lost to the Southern States. He took occasion to deprecate the restrictive system in commerce, which the present administration of this country had manifested so strong an inclination to follow, and which must ultimately lead to a separation among the States.

The amendment of Mr Holmes closing the intercourse with the Canadas by land as well as by sea, was adopted by 32 votes to 12. The House was afterwards adjourned by the casting vote of the President.

On the 24th the discussion was renewed, and after several additional amendments had been proposed, the vote of the Senate was at length taken upon the passing of the Bill as proposed by the committee, when it was decided to reject the Bill by a majority of 9 votes.

I understand that it now remains to reproduce the Bill, altered according to the various amendments which have been proposed.

The Session of Congress must close on the 3rd of March, there is scarcely [time], therefore, for the Senate to agree upon an act in another form (considering the great variety of amendments which have been offered), which shall meet with the concurrence of the House, and it can scarcely be expected that a new act should originate in the House of Representatives where the discussion has not yet commenced, in time for the Senate to accede to it.

As I feel it my duty not to lose the opportunity of sending you some account of the proceedings in the Senate by the first Liverpool packet which sails from New York and as the sitting of the Senate was not over until a late hour last night, I cannot yet inform you of the course which it is probable will be pursued upon the rejection of the Bill as proposed by their committee of Commerce.

XVI. CHARLES R. VAUGHAN TO GEORGE CANNING.

WASHINGTON

3rd March 1827

*Mr Canning,*

*Sir,* I had the honor to inform you in my dispatch No. 9, that the act respecting commercial intercourse with the British Colonies, which had been offered by the Committee of Commerce, to both Houses of Congress, was rejected in the Senate. On the 28th February an amendment proposed by General Smith was carried by a majority of 32 to 10 and passed in the Senate as an act substituted for the one proposed by the committee.

I have the honor to enclose a copy of this act as it was transmitted to the House of Representatives, which at the moment of its being communicated was engaged in discussing the act as proposed by their committee, but it was agreed to suspend the debate and on the 1st inst. the act received from the Senate was taken into consideration.

The first section of this act provides that from and after the 31st December next, no other or higher duties shall be levied upon British vessels and cargoes arriving from any British Ports, declared by the British Government to be free. Free Ports, in the ports of the United States, excepting Florida, than upon vessels and cargoes belonging to the United States.

By the 2nd section of the Act of the Senate, the Acts of Congress of the 1st March 1823—of the 15th May 1820 and of the 18th of April 1818 are suspended until December 31st next, excepting so much thereof as imposes Discriminating duties on the tonnage of Foreign vessels and cargoes.

By the 3rd section it is provided that if at any time before the 31st December next the President of the United States should receive satisfactory evidence, that the prohibition to commercial intercourse between vessels of the United States and the British Colonies, mentioned in the order in Council of the 27th July 1826 has ceased or been removed and that no discriminating duties of tonnage or impost are levied within the British Free Ports, upon vessels and cargoes from the United States, the President is authorized to issue his proclamation, declaring that the acts mentioned in the 2nd section are *altogether* suspended and repealed.

In the House of Representatives on the 2nd of March Mr Tomlinson the chairman of the committee of commerce moved an amendment of the 3rd section of the act received from the Senate, a copy of which I have the honor to inclose.

The purport of it seems to be, to engage positively for the act of 1818 and 1820 being put into force on the 31st December next and for the repeal of the act of 1823, in the event of the President not having received information by the 31st December that should justify the issuing of the Proclamation as authorized by this act.

This amendment was opposed but carried by a majority of 80 to 56.

The Senate has refused to agree to this amendment after a conference, and the House of Representatives has resolved to adhere to it by a vote of 75 to 65.

The session of Congress must terminate to-morrow the 4th of March and as I understand that the question of Colonial intercourse is not to be again renewed in any shape in either House before the final close of the session, the Bill is lost, and that question must remain in the same state as upon the opening of this Session.

By the 6th section of the Act of Congress of March 1st 1823, the President is directed to issue a proclamation to put in force and revive the acts of Congress of the 18th of April 1818 and of the 15th May 1820, if at any time the intercourse between the United States and the British Colonial Ports should be prohibited by an order in council or an act of Parliament. The President stated to the Congress that he had thought it expedient, not to exercise the authority given to him by the act of 1823, when the order in Council was issued by His Majesty, but to leave it to the Congress which was about to meet, to decide upon what measures it might be advisable to adopt, as the Congress has thrown back upon the President, the adoption of measures, by the rejection of the Bills which have been under discussion, it is presumed that no alternative remains, than for the President to issue his Proclamation, putting in force the acts of Congress of 1818 and 1820.

These acts close the ports of the United States to British vessels from Colonies closed to the Americans and the act of 1820 closes the ports to British vessels from Lower Canada and New Brunswick and limits the import from certain British Ports enumerated and the produce of the country from whence they sailed.

Although the Congress of the United States has had before it the Bill recommended by the committees ever since the commencement of the Session, it has not been taken into consideration until within ten days of the close of the Session in either House, when amendments have been offered by members in both Houses according to the local interests of their respective States.

An amendment of the Bill was strongly supported in both Houses, which went to close the intercourse with the Canadas by land as well as by sea. Such an amendment though not finally put into the Bill was carried by a majority in the Senate of 32 to 12 and a similar amendment to the Bill from the Committee of Commerce was carried in the House of Representatives.

In the course of the Debate it was remarked, that for a length of time Great Britain, has been endeavouring to improve the resources of the Canadas, and to raise them up as rivals to the United States. The Representatives of the State of New York, Vermont, and the majority of those from Maine, resisted the closing of the intercourse by land with the Canadas. They estimated the value of the trade so carried on at 1.800.000 Dollars, of which sum, not 50.000 dollars, ever found it way to the West Indies. Many coarse articles of manufacture are furnished, it was

said, by the United States to the Canadas and they are dependent for their supply of salt, upon the State of New York. To close that intercourse went beyond the present object of repelling the measures adopted by Great Britain, and to do so was to enter at once into a contest for the balance of commercial advantages.

It was stated in Congress that though the navigation of the Lake Ontario was equally divided between the British and Americans, upon Lake Champlain 260 American vessels were exclusively employed. Quebec furnished a ready market for the produce of Vermount and the valley of the Lake Champlain the intercourse was greatly exceeded in value, by the trade which takes place between the western part of the State of New York and Montreal.

During the late discussion it was asserted, that the value of the trade between the United States and the whole of the West Indies (not the British alone), amounted to 7,156,000 Dollars. in 1821 it employed 32,000 tons—in 1823—70,000 tons, and in 1825, 101,000 tons of shipping.

The State of North Carolina, alone, employed in that trade 20.000 tons of shipping, and it was asserted that the West India Trade gave to the Navy of the United States 10.000 seamen.

I have ventured to notice some of the Statements which have been made during this discussion, without being able in any shape to vouch for their accuracy. It was observed by Mr Camberleng of New York,[1] that the Congress might rest assured, that if this branch of commerce was to be recovered, they must make very liberal offers to Great Britain.

The result of the discussion in the Congress, is, to leave the question where it was at the commencement of the Session. The conduct of the Government has been blamed for having left to negotiation, what should have been done, during the last Session, by Legislation ; and a conviction prevades both the Government and the Country, that the United States have only themselves to blame for the situation in which they are at present.

The decisive measure of His Majesty's Government has had the effect of producing the consent of this Government to several points long disputed, and I trust that it may prove a seasonable check upon those exaggerated pretensions and that tenacity of opinion which has sometimes marked the negotiations with the United States.

### XVII. Charles R. Vaughan to George Canning.

Washington

13th March 1827

*Mr Canning*,

*Sir*, I am not yet able to state to you in what manner the President means to carry into effect by his proclamation the closing of the Ports of the United States against vessels from British Colonies, the ports of which have been closed to American shipping by His Majesty's

[1] C. C. Cambreleng.—Ed.

order in Council. Mr Clay has this day informed me, that he had expected that he should have been able by this time, to have made to me a communication upon the subject, but after several meetings of the President and the Ministers, nothing had yet been finally resolved upon; he has given me to understand, however, that a proclamation will certainly be issued by the President in conformity with the provisions of the Act of Congress of 1823, but at what time and in what manner the Proclamation should be carried into effect had occasioned repeated deliberations. Mr Clay has assured me that it is the intention of the Government of the United States to apply the measure pointed out in the Act of Congress of 1823, with as little risk of injury to British subjects engaged in the Colonial trade as possible, of the propriety of which, I told him, that there could not be a doubt, after the forbearance shown by Great Britain in carrying into effect the Act of Parliament of 1825, and the order in Council of the 27th July 1827, and after all parties in the discussion which had recently taken place in Congress agreed in one point, that of not carrying into effect any one of their proposed restrictive measures without due notice.

The President and his Ministers are again to assemble to-morrow upon this subject, and I have no doubt but that their final decision will soon be known.

I think that the Government of the United States has been anxious to receive some communication from Mr Gallatin before any decisive measure was taken and I learn that Mr Gallatin's dispatches lately received do not hold out to this Government, any hopes of a reconciliation of the views of Great Britain and of the United States upon the subject of Colonial intercourse.

### XVIII. Charles R. Vaughan to George Canning.

Washington

21 June 1827

*Mr Canning,*

*Sir.* Although reports have reached Washington, of changes having taken place in His Majesty's Councils, as I have not yet received official advice of the change which may have taken place in the Foreign Department, I continue to address my Dispatches to yourself.

As the Secretary of State is absent from Washington, a temporary suspension of intercourse has taken place, between the General Government and Foreign Ministers, which must plead an excuse for my reports being now less frequent than usual.

The Legislative Assemblies of the State of Massachusetts have made choice of Mr Webster to represent that State in Congress as Senator, and the President and his ministers are thereby deprived of a powerful supporter of their measures in the House of Representatives, but he will continue to support them in the Senate, where a more formidable opposition will render his services equally acceptable to them.

I have learned from Mr Ward, who visited Washington on his return

home from Mexico, that the Representatives of that Republic, have rejected the commercial treaty negotiated by Mr Poinsett, the minister from the United States. Whenever this event is generally known in this country, it will probably contribute to exasperate the feelings against the President, which have been excited by the loss of the Colonial trade, which has been attributed to his mismanagement.

The newspapers attached to this Government are still employed in giving a colour to the late discussions upon that subject, with His Majesty's Government, favourable to the American ministers and I presume that the subject will be renewed in some shape or other, very soon after the meeting of Congress on the 4th of December next.

It is known here that representations have been made by the people of the British North American Colonies, to induce His Majesty's Government to continue the present suspension of intercourse between the United States and the British West Indies, which will probably lead to a renewal of the proposals which were so favourably received during the last Session of Congress, for throwing every obstacle in the way of commercial intercourse by land with the Canadas. It is conjectured that efforts may be made to regain the Colonial trade by acts being passed in Congress which should place, unequivocally, the United States within the conditions of the Act of Parliament of 1825.

I should be happy to learn in what manner any such measures would be received by His Majesty's Government that in my intercourse with the several parties here my language might be in strict conformity with those views.

The following letter from Huskisson, preserved among Vaughan's papers is full of interest as explaining the policy which greatly prevailed. It shows too how carefully Huskisson, aided by Vaughan, was feeling the pulse of American opinion, though in one instance he committed himself to a rash prophecy.

XIX. WILLIAM HUSKISSON TO JOHN BACKHOUSE.

RICHMOND TERRACE,
15th June 1829.

*To Mr Backhouse,*
*My dear Sir,*

I called the attention of the House to the American Tariff at the close of last Session, the day before I left town for the Continent, 18th July. I have this morning looked at the report of what I said in Hansard's Debates,[1] but it is very incorrectly given. I do not

[1] Vol. XIX, new series, pp. 1768–1775. "The rice of India would soon (indeed it was already doing so) usurp the place, in our list of imports, which that of Carolina had done. In other articles the same change would soon be observed. With reference to cotton, that raw article so essential in our great staple trade, it was only necessary to give its culture in India the same encouragement which the indigo trade had obtained, to ensure its cultivation with equal success."

William Huskisson, 1770–1830, represented Liverpool in Parliament. He was for a time President of the Board of Trade and afterwards Secretary of State for the Colonies.—ED.

recollect any other occasion upon which I *adverted directly* to the American Tariff, but I have frequently had imposed upon me the duty of expounding the principles generally applicable to matters of this nature. The only speeches which I recollect to have revised and printed separately, in which those subjects are incidentally discussed were,—1st. one on Foreign Commerce. 25th March 1825. 2nd one on our Colonial Policy, 21st March 1825. 3rd. one on shipping and Emigration, 12th May 1826,—and 4th. another on the same subject, 7th May 1827. All published at Hansard's. I do not recollect to have read any publication on the American Tariff except an article (not a very able one) in a late number of the Edinburgh Review.

The object of my speech last year, was to alarm the Southern States in respect to the means within our power, of drawing from other countries the articles with which we are now supplied principally from those States; and to show them (whether we resorted to those means or not) that in proportion as British manufactured goods were rendered dear to the American consumers, would the expense of raising their raw materials be increased, and our power, as well as our disposition, to purchase them be diminished. I was not for holding out threats of retaliation, at least in the first instance, and I am sure the Government has acted very wisely in avoiding any such course. It would have enlisted national feelings of a different description into a question altogether commercial, and have prevented the possibility of the Washington Government doing what it is now, I am glad to see, inclined to attempt, on grounds purely American. I trust this attempt will be successful, but if it should be defeated, as Mr. Vaughan apprehends it will, by the strength of Adams' party, it will expedite an event inevitable, I think, at no distant period—the separation of the Southern States—provided we cautiously abstain from taking any part in their domestic differences, and can avoid any dispute which might merge their internal dissensions in a feeling of general hostility to this Country.

I will only further state that I am perfectly satisfied that we have it in our power to encourage the supply of cotton and rice, from other countries, particularly Brazil and British India, and perhaps Egypt, in a manner that would, in a few years, render us far less dependent than we now are on the U.S, and that the means for this purpose may be carried into effect without any infraction of the existing Convention with the U.S. It will be most prudent, however, not to bring them forward till we see what Jackson can and will do.

Yours truly,

W. Huskisson.

### XX. Charles R. Vaughan to John Backhouse.

Boston,
28th August 1829.

*My dear Sir,*

I am very much obliged to you for the prompt attention which you have paid to my request, to be furnished with information respecting the operation of the last American Tariff, and with any arguments which might tend to shew the impolicy of that measure with regard to the interests to the Americans themselves. I have to thank you for a copy of the Edinburgh Review, and for some speeches of Mr Huskisson, but more particularly for the note addressed by him to yourself, from which I collect, with great pleasure, the facts that it is not the intention to bring forward at present any measures of retaliation in the British Parliament. I am very anxious that the question of the repeal of the tariff in the American Congress next winter, shall in no shape be injured by any indiscreet putting forward of *English* interests. If the repeal is to take place it must result from a conviction of the impolicy of the tariff as regards *American* interests. I have suggested to those who are anxious to get rid of the tariff, the necessity of applying with the utmost diligence to the amassing of information before the Congress meets, respecting the exact state of loss and profit in the manufacturing establishments which have sprung up under the exorbitant duties imposed on foreign manufacture. I have lately passed through some of the New England States, and wherever I have found manufacturing establishments, many of which are upon a large scale, I have invariably heard rumours of their very depressed state and of the prospects of their being abandoned. It has been stated to me that shares in manufacturing establishments which sold at 15 per cent advance on each share twelve months ago, are now at a discount of 75 per cent—this however is merely vague report.

Notwithstanding the President's determination to get rid of or to modify at least the tariff, I confess that I am under great apprehension that he will fail. It will be made the great question on which the parties of the Ex President and the present President will try their strength. The administration formed by General Jackson carries with it but little weight of talent or character, as it is at present constituted it has disappointed general expectation. It will be opposed upon the tariff question by a combination throughout one half of the States of persons who have vested their money in manufactures and of political characters who are pledged to support the American system.

In passing through the town of Lowell in New Hampshire I saw a fair specimen of the excess to which the national rage for becoming manufacturers has driven the people of the United States. I believe that I do not exaggerate the number of establishments in Lowell for the manufacture of woollens and cotton, if I rate them at 30, all large, well built piles of buildings. This rage for manufactures seems to indicate that notwithstanding temporary difficulties and losses the U.S. must ultimately afford a very contracted market for foreign goods: nor do I

believe that any free admission of American corn into British Ports will materially check the rage I allude to. The embargo and non importation acts which preceded the war of 1812 first gave the impulse to manufactures, and when the merchants in the United States were glutted with foreign goods [upon place taking place][1] the outcry began of those who had embarked capital in manufactures for the protection of the Government which has been afforded by repeated tariffs in the most extravagant manner.

I beg your pardon for having ventured to write you so much upon this subject. I cannot conclude without requesting that you will have the goodness to continue to furnish me with any publications which may appear in England, from whence anything can be gleaned of service to those who are engaged in opposing the tariff.

It is remarkable that from the accession of Jackson we find next to nothing in Vaughan's papers which bear on the tariff question. With Jackson personally his relations were from the outset most friendly, and it is clear that Vaughan rated his character and ability highly and credited him with a cordial feeling towards England. Nor is there any trace of friction in Vaughan's dealings with Van Buren, and at a later date they were intimate. But it is plain that up to 1828 Clay was the American Politician with whom Vaughan was most intimate, that no one in the new Cabinet seems ever to have taken his place.

In March 1830 we find Vaughan writing to Lord Aberdeen that no relaxation of the tariff was to be expected. Northern opinion, he says, is too strong for Jackson to defy. The same view is expressed a fortnight later in a despatch to Parliament.

There is however a significant passage in that despatch. "American opinion," Vaughan says "has been quite precipitated by the language used in Parliament, and especially by Peel." Peel was only following the lead of his colleague Huskisson. Before the year was out the patient and tactful firmness had its reward. Jackson and McLane the American representative in England were both honestly anxious to come to terms and the discriminating duties were withdrawn.[2]

The troubles arising out of protection and out of the fiscal system favored by Clay, and by the Northern manufacturers were far from being over. They soon entered on an acute phase of which

[1] The words bracketed appear in the copy. I have inserted brackets to make meaning clear.—Ed.

[2] Mr. McLane, as minister to England, received humble and deprecatory instructions from Van Buren which have become somewhat celebrated because of the space given them in Benton, *Thirty Years View*, I., 216. Mr. Adams calls them "objectionable." *Life of Albert Gallatin*, p. 618. For the acts and proclamation ending the dispute see Hertslet's, *Commercial and Slave Trade Treaties*, Vol. IV. 512 ff.—Ed.

we can learn much from Vaughan's later papers. But the difficulties were purely internal and affected Great Britain only remotely and indirectly.

Vaughan's actual share in the settlement of the commercial difficulty was but slight. Yet no one can read his papers and doubt that his influence counted for a good deal. His observation of the conditions of the dispute was keen, accurate and minute. He saw himself, and he kept clearly before his government, the main forces at work, and never suffered them to be obscured by temporary or personal issues. And it is clear too that his influence was steadily and successfully directed to modifying the temperature whenever it threatened to reach a dangerous heat.

As the following despatch shows, one of the great questions that Vaughan had to take in hand was that of the slave trade. For American statesmen the question bristled with difficulties and these were complicated by the fact that the suppression of the slave trade could not be kept distinct from that thorny business, the right of search.

XXI. CHARLES R. VAUGHAN TO GEORGE CANNING.

WASHINGTON,

30th September 1825.

*Sir*,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt on the 26th inst. by the Packet King Fisher, of your dispatch No. 3. accompanying a full power, with which His Majesty has been pleased to invest me, to enable me to sign a treaty, with the Government of the United States, for the more effectual suppression of the Slave Trade.

By the receipt of this full power, I am placed in the same situation, in which His Majesty's Government had placed Mr Addington, the late Chargé d'Affaires, who was empowered to conclude a treaty upon terms precisely laid down at the end of the last year, whenever the Government of the United States should manifest a determination to accede to those terms.

Of the nature of those terms this Government has been already fully apprised, and I have contented myself therefore with announcing, verbally, to Mr Clay, that I have received His Majesty's Full Power, which I shall be ready to act upon, whenever I shall learn from him that the American Government wished to carry the proposed treaty into effect.

Before I venture to shew any solicitude to reopen the question of the treaty, it appears to me absolutely necessary to ascertain the probable result of a renewed discussion in the Senate, particularly, as I am directed to submit to His Majesty's Government no other than a complete Instrument, one that shall have already received the ratification of that body.

In order to ascertain the feelings of the Senate, we must await its assembling in the month of December, as the opposition to the treaty

when last submitted to it, was in part attributed to the violence of Party spirit which chose to make the supposed cession of a limited right of search, a means of rendering Mr Adams unpopular, who was one of the candidates for the office of President, some hope might have been reasonably entertained, that the feelings of the Senate when it next assembled, would probably be changed. Mr Clay, however, reminded me, that the Senate had subsequently refused their ratification of a treaty with Columbia, because it contained a concession, similar to the one objected to in the convention with Great Britain, and he confessed that he did not see any reason to expect that the feelings were materially altered— at the period of the last discussion, Mr Monroe was President, and was very anxious that the treaty should be ratified. Mr Clay confessed that Mr Adams, who then had the department of state, was of a different opinion. The favourable disposition however, of the executive part of the Government is of less consequence, as it cannot exercise any control over the Senate. It must be recollected that the Committee of the House of Representatives to which the papers had been referred, previously to the breaking up of the Congress, presented but a vague report, unaccompanied with any recommendation to the House to reconsider the question. This was followed by a motion of Mr Forsyth expressive of disapprobation of any cession of the right of search.

Mr Clay said that the only circumstance which he had observed, indicating a change in favour of the Treaty, was in an article which had appeared very lately in a great number of Provincial newspapers purporting to be a letter from Sierra Leone, announcing that three American vessels had lately engaged in the slave trade, profiting by the absence of all American cruizers, and great regret was expressed in this article, that the proposed treaty with Great Britain had not taken effect last year, as it would have enabled the British Cruizers to seize the three American vessels.

Referring to all that has passed relative to the treaty for the suppression of the slave trade last year, and in the want of instructions upon the subject, and knowing that the senate has not undergone any such material change in its composition as can reconcile one to running the risk of again calling for the submission of the treaty to the ratification of the very same individuals who so lately manifested their dislike of the stipulations which caused its rejection, I shall content myself with having announced to the ministers of state that I am in possession of full powers until I receive fresh instructions from His Majesty's Government.

The paucity of any later references to the business show that both Vaughan and the government for which he acted had but scanty hopes of successful negotiation on this point. In this matter Jackson inherited and continued the policy of Adams. On one occasion we find that Jackson refused to sign a convention for the suppression of the slave trade on the ground that it would give British officials the opportunity and pretext for interfering with

American vessels. And scattered references show that on more than one occasion Vaughan's tact and power of conciliation were called into play to settle differences arising out of an alleged abuse of the right of search.

So far I have confined myself to those definite questions of international relations of which the history can be traced out in full, or at least largely illustrated, from Vaughan's despatches and the papers which accompany them, I now propose to deal shortly with those passages which throw light on the various pictures of national life which came under his notice, and on the working of American constitutions and the character of leading statesmen.

It was Vaughan's practice throughout life to leave memoranda of remarkable incidents, possibly designed to serve either himself or those who came after him as materials for a connected biography. Of such the following is an interesting specimen. Probably most students of American history will think that Vaughan's informants overrated Monroe's faults, and did inadequate justice to his merits.

XXII. MEMORANDUM BY CHARLES R. VAUGHAN.

Mr Monroe—Ex President of the United States.

Mr Archer of Virginia and Mr George Erving discussing at my table the character of Mr Monroe on the 3rd January 1830, made it appear that he was a very inferior man in point of talent, with great indecision of character, and perfectly unfit to manage any affairs even in public or domestic life.

General Washington once conceded to a prevailing party of the day, the nomination of a Minister to France during the Revolutionary movement in that country between the years 90 and 93. That party proposed Mr Monroe to the great surprise of Washington, as he had never shewn any talent in public life. However he consented to his appointment and after a short residence in France Washington was obliged to recall him. Monroe afterwards became the personal friend of Jefferson and Madison, and it was asserted that he had been repeatedly saved by them from repeated disgrace.

He was sent to France to join Livingston and another American commissioned to arrange the purchase of Louisiana—as the purchase was arranged finally soon after his arrival in Paris, he had the credit of having concluded the negotiation, whereas the memoirs of M. Bourienne shew clearly that the price had been fixed by Buonaparte and that the Americans had paid about 3 million of francs more than the price which Buonaparte was willing to accept, and that Mr Monroe had not contributed in the slightest degree to the completion of the bargain.

By accident Mr Monroe had succeeded ad interim to the Department of War, when the successful defence of New Orleans by General Jackson took place, and the people chose to imagine that their success ought to

be attributed to the measures taken by the minister of War, Mr Monroe, and the result was that he was named President of the United States.

Mr Archer and Mr Erving in short described Mr Monroe as a man of most feeble character, as the creature of circumstances, constantly indebted to the decided support which he received throughout his public life, from Messrs Madison and Jefferson.

As an instance of the debility of his character, they mentioned that when he was President, he never gave away an office without requiring from the person to whom he gave it, all sorts of recommendations, which he might produce, should the propriety of his choice be called in question.

A despatch sent by Vaughan in his first year of office to Canning shows that another thunder-cloud heavy with coming strife, was forcing itself on his view. In November, 1825, he reports that Illinois and Connecticut have petitioned for the abolition of slavery, that the governor of Georgia in his message has protested against this as an infringement of state rights.

A later despatch of Vaughan's reminds us of the fashion in which that system which southerners of the school of Calhoun and Stephens regarded as "airth's greatest boon" needed to be buttressed up. Vaughan reports to Lord Palmerston that he has had to intervene and ask relief from the Federal government to protect a British subject from the consequences of a state law of South Carolina. By that law a man of color though free, might, if the vessel on which he was a passenger touched at any port in South Carolina, be arrested and detained in gaol till the vessel sailed.

The following despatches, written just as the forces were marshalling themselves for the great Jacksonian battles show how fully Vaughan had mastered the main issues which divided parties, and how he clearly understood that the President was engaged in a double-handed conflict, in which he represented the unity of the Federation as against Southern nullifiers, the old Jeffersonian doctrine of state rights as against northern Whigs.

XXIII. CHARLES R. VAUGHAN TO THE EARL OF ABERDEEN.

WASHINGTON,

4th June 1830.

*The Earl of Aberdeen*
*My Lord,*

In my despatch No. 29, I had the honour to transmit to your Lordship a copy of the Message sent by the President to the House of Representatives, giving at length his reasons for refusing to sign a Bill, which had passed both Houses of Congress, authorising a subscription of 150 thousand Dollars to the Maysville Turnpike Road, to be made in the State

of Kentucky. On the last day of the Session of Congress a Bill was returned by the President to the Senate, with his refusal to sign it, communicated in a short message a copy of which is inclosed, in which the Senate is referred to the statement of his objections to similar Bills already made, upon the occasion of his rejection of the Maysville Road Bill.

The Bill returned to the Senate was to authorise a subscription of Stock to the Washington Road, and as it had originated in the Senate, they proceeded immediately to reconsider the Bill, according to the manner pointed out in the 7th section of the First Article of the Constitution, when 21 voted for the passage of the Bill and 17 against it, but as two thirds of the Senators present had not voted for its passage the Bill was rejected.

On the same day, the President announced to Congress his intention of retaining for further consideration two Bills which had been sent to him for his signature, having passed both Houses, the one for making an additional appropriation of money for the Louisville and Portland Canal, and the other appropriating 501,044 dollars to be distributed in almost every State and territory for constructing light houses, buoys and harbours.

With regard to the President retaining these two Bills, I have been assured that they were passed very late in the Session of the House of Representatives, which commenced at ten o'clock in the morning of the 29th and was continued until two o'clock in the morning of the 30th and that they were not sent to the President until the 31st a few minutes only before the final close of the Session.

Some objection has been made to the President returning a Road Bill, which he had signed, with a message, a copy of which is inclosed, declaring that he had signed it with an understanding that the Road was not to be continued beyond the Michigan territory. This qualified signature is thought to imply an unconstitutional right to construe the Acts of Congress.

The right of the General Government to dispose of money in the Treasury for promoting internal improvements, has long been contested in the United States. The Southern States have taken the lead in opposing a continuation of that system, and the President coincides in their opposition, believing that the profuse grants to States, every succeeding Session of Congress for objects of local rather than national advantage, will protract the term for the final liquidation of the National debt, and that the funds for such objects should be provided out of the resources of the States by their respective Legislatures.

A majority of the Houses of Congress having supported the system of grants from the Treasury for internal improvements, the only means left of checking the system, was, that the President should exercise his constitutional power of refusing his signature to Bills having that object in view.

The conduct of the President may induce a belief that the Congress must have separated with some feeling of resentment towards him, but I

do not think that the numbers of the members opposed to his election from the beginning will be increased by his decided resistance to grants of the public money for internal improvements, and I observe, already, that admiration is expressed of the firmness and decision with which he has taken his stand upon principles, which he is known to entertain with many of the most disinterested and distinguished persons in the country.

I must not omit to state to your Lordship that Bills were passed before the Congress closed, and were signed by the President, reducing very considerably the duties upon the importation of four articles received in this Country from the West Indies—molasses, salt, sugar and coffee. As I am not yet in possession of the Bills I cannot state the exact amount of the reduction of duties. I have already acquainted your Lordship with the proceedings of Congress with regard to the tariff. The members of the Southern States assert that enough has transpired to convince them that the "American System" must be abandoned within the course of a year.

Vaughan was in England on leave during the crisis of nullification and thus there is a serious gap in his correspondence as bearing on this question. The following letters throw an interesting light on the later phases of the contest.

XXIV. CHARLES R. VAUGHAN TO VISCOUNT PALMERSTON.

NEW YORK,

31st March 1833.

*Viscount Palmerston.*

*My Lord,*

I have the honour to inform your Lordship that I arrived here on the 26th inst. after a passage from Liverpool of thirty days, and it is my intention to proceed without further delay to Washington.

The last Despatches of Mr Bankhead will have made your Lordship fully acquainted with the proceedings of Congress, which terminated in the adoption of a Bill for modifying the Tariff Act, imposing duties upon Foreign manufactures. Upon my arrival at New York I found that intelligence had just been received of the final settlement of the dissention between the General Government and the State of South Carolina, the convention of the State having rescinded their ordinance, rendering null and of no effect the Tariff Act, as soon as the modification of that Act by Congress was submitted to them, a minority of only four voted against rescinding the ordinance. This decided majority seems to justify the inference which has been drawn from it, that the people of South Carolina, finding that they were not supported by any of the Southern States, were glad to avail themselves of any concession by Congress, to withdraw from the position in which they had hastily and injudiciously placed themselves.

I find upon my arrival here that all parties are well pleased that the

late serious indication of disunion in the Confederation has been fortunately put an end to. The great and influential State of New York, and the States of New England forgot their party animosities, which had been recently called forth by the Presidential election, and came forward at once to approve and support the principles of resistance to the pretentions of South Carolina, which were laid down in the Proclamation of the President General Jackson. Though the Southern States do not coincide with the opinions expressed by the President, and disapproved of the Tariff, their reluctance to join South Carolina at once destroyed all expectation of seeing a Southern Confederacy established, and it is thought that the late events may ultimately give additional stability to the present constitution of Government of the United States.

We are yet to ascertain the result in the North Eastern States of the abandonment of the "American system," which was established for the protection and encouragement of the domestic manufactures of the States. It is believed that that system must be abandoned before the term of nine years, which is the period fixed in Mr Clay's Bill for the final adjustment of Duties upon imported foreign manufactures. The greater Capitalists of those States who have invested their property in manufacturing establishments have derived this advantage from Mr Clay's Bill, that it has put a stop to the competition to which they were exposed, and already they have secured a better price for their goods.

The Session of Congress has closed with a singular and unexpected combination of Parties. The concession which has tranquilized South Carolina was brought forward by Mr Clay, the decided opponent of the President, and whose pretentions to be elected in his room rested upon his zealous and uncompromising support of the American system. The Bill of Mr Clay was substituted (sic) in the House of Representatives after the members had been involved in a fruitless discussion for some weeks of the details of a Bill for modifying the Tariff proposed by the Government.

All parties approve of the conduct of the President. A less decisive mind at the head of the Government in such a crisis, would according to general opinion have given rise to much mischief.

The right maintained by South Carolina, of peaceable secession from the Union, is now decided as unconstitutional doctrine, but it is expected that State Rights founded on their reserved sovereignty will be a fruitful source of discussion during the next Session of Congress. It seems to be a misapplication of terms to talk of allegiance to such a form of Government. Implicit obedience to the Laws is the bond of Union and the late events have proved how doubtful the duration of it is.

I lose no time in forwarding to your Lordship the information I have collected at New York, before I have had any communication with the Government of the United States as the correspondence of Mr Bankhead with H. M. Government is suspended in consequence of my arrival.

### XXV. Charles R. Vaughan to Viscount Palmerston.

Washington

21st April 1833.

*Viscount Palmerston,*
*My Lord,*

Though the Bill proposed by Mr Clay, and passed by Congress, admitting the principle that the duties upon imports shall be eventually reduced to a revenue standard, and that no more money shall be raised than may be necessary to the economical administration of the Government, has been received by the State of Carolina as a measure of peace and conciliation, yet it would appear, from a letter dated the 27th March, which has been published by Mr Calhoun, and other proceedings in the South, that the lots dissension is not yet finally settled.

Mr Calhoun asserts that the struggle to preserve the Constitution, and to arrest the dangerous tendency of the Government, so far from being over, is not more than fairly commenced.

The principle for which South Carolina contended has been acknowledged in Mr Clay's Bill—"The rejected and reviled right of nullification" has proved to be peaceable and efficient remedy. The theory of the Constitution, which during the late dissension it has been attempted to establish, denies that the constitution is a compact between the States, and denies its Federal character. The question now is, whether the General Government be a consolidated Government with unrestricted powers, or a Federal Republic of State[s] with limited powers. The Government must be restricted within its proper sphere, and its tendency like all Governments, to despotic rule, must be corrected. Such are the opinions published by Mr Calhoun, one of the ablest leaders of the nullification party. Whatever may be the personal influence of the leaders of the party, the principles advanced in the Southern States have received so decided a check, by the declaration of the people of a great majority of the States, against their right to nullify an act of the General Government that they cannot hope to act with effect.

Mr Calhoun recommends determined resistance to what is called the "Force Bill." The Bill passed by Congress, giving power to the President to enforce the execution of the Tariff law in South Carolina. When the Convention of South Carolina agreed to rescind its ordinance of nullification, it did not separate before by a vote of 132 to 19 they had nullified the "Force Act," and the Legislature of South Carolina has decreed that the existing organization of the Volunteers shall be maintained so long as the Bill remains unrepealed.

In a speech delivered by Governor Hayne, upon presenting, at the beginning of the month (April) a new standard to the Volunteers of Charleston, upon which the arms of the State were embroidered, he stated the force of the Volunteers throughout Carolina at 20,000 men, but only 500 volunteers appeared in uniform and armed at the celebration on that occasion, though the total force enrolled in Charleston was said on good

authority to amount to 13,000. The troops of the United States which were sent to the fortresses at Charleston, and the five companies collected upon the Frontier of that State in Georgia have been withdrawn by the General Government.

In Virginia, Mr Tyler, a distinguished Senator in Congress from that State, took occasion at a dinner given to him to justify the conduct of South Carolina and to reprobate the doctrine that the Government of the United States was the work of the people, and not the result of a compact between separate and sovereign States. He denies the claim of the Federal Government to the exclusive allegiance of the Citizen, and that an act of resistance to that General Government can be regarded as treason and rebellion, to be put down by the employment of the whole Naval and Military forces of the country.

Mr Tyler seems to consider the General Government as an agency created for particular objects. That allegiance is not due to it because it is invested with the power of providing protection against Foreign Nations, and for the common deference[1] and welfare.

I see that it is acknowledged by Mr McDuffie in a speech delivered in South Carolina that through the reduction of duties, under Mr Clay's Bill, would not be complete until the year 1842, many articles imported from Foreign Countries which are consumed in the Southern States, would be rendered free of duty in a short time. The price of linens and worsted stuffs would soon be reduced much in price, and that it was a just cause of triumph, that the stand made by South Carolina against the unconstitutional, unjust and unequal law of the tariff, had compelled the Government to abandon their system of levying duties on articles of foreign manufacture for the protection of domestic industry.

In Virginia there has been a great division of opinion, but the result of the elections which are just over in that State, indicates by the return of a majority of members to Congress, who are declared supporters of the President, the prevalence of opinions opposed to the principles lately put forth by the neighboring State of South Carolina. Had however another year passed without an adjustment of the Tariff, it seems very doubtful what might have been the line adopted by Virginia.

We must expect a renewal of debates upon the constitutional question of State Rights during the next Session of Congress. The Repeal and removal from the Book of Statutes, of the "Force Bill," will be one of the first measures adopted by the Southern States. It is rumoured that an attempt will be made, to unite the Southern States against the Union, by instilling the minds of the proprietors of slaves, that there is a fixed design in the Northern States to abolish Negro slavery. It is well known how sensitive the people of the Southern States are upon that point, and it is not impossible that a controversy will soon be excited upon that subject. I observe, that a great interest is taken here, in the feelings of the Government and people of Great Britain in relation to the emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies.

[1] Probably intended to be defence.—Ed.

### XXVI. Charles R. Vaughan to Viscount Palmerston.

Washington,

20th July 1833.

*Viscount Palmerston*
*My Lord,*

. . . The calm has not yet been disturbed in the Southern States, which immediately [followed] the mutual compromise of their interests and those of the Northern States by the Bill which passed at the close of the last Session of Congress modifying the duties upon foreign manufactures. It is asserted, however, that there is a deep and settled determination amongst the people of the South to bring about a separation. The people of the Northern States are unanimous and decided in maintaining the Union, and all parties united, on the occasion of the President's late visit, to express to him their admiration of the prompt, firm and judicious measures which he adopted to counteract the movement in South Carolina. There is evidently a disposition amongst some people without influence to excite a collision of interests between the Northern and Southern States, by agitating the question of the emancipation of the slaves of the latter, but the leading men of the North positively deny any intention of agitating that question in any shape, and by the constitution of the United States the Congress has no right to interfere, and the condition of the slaves is exclusively under the control of the Legislatures of the slave-holding States.

But the most interesting document in the whole collection bearing on the question of nullification is Vaughan's account of an interview with William IV., in which he explained to the King the situation, forecast its probable issue. It shows how far Vaughan was from accepting the view of the situation taken by Huskisson, who, as we have seen, looked on the separation of North and South as inevitable. The paper belongs to that class of memoranda, which, as we have already seen, Vaughan was given to composing.

### XXVII. Memorandum by Charles R. Vaughan.

Communication with the King. Summary of Mr Clay and Hayne's Speeches on the Tariff.

In the month of March 1832, the reports of the state of domestic politics in the United States of America received by the Marchioness Wellesley from her family, and reported to the King, induced His Majesty to request my attendance at St James on the 11th April, when the King did me the honour to communicate to me that Marchioness Wellesley, then in attendance upon the Queen as Lady of the Bedchamber had informed their Majesties that a separation would probably take place of the States at present forming the Union and that it became necessary for England to decide upon the policy which in that event should be adopted. There seemed to be a conviction upon His Majesty's

mind, that the right policy to adopt would be that of strict alliance with the Northern States. His Majesty however, commanded me to see Lord Palmerston and to make enquiries at the Foreign Office, and to examine any communications which might have been received there in confirmation of the information derived from the Marchioness Wellesley. His Majesty at the same time authorizing me to say to Lord Palmerston, that any negotiations to be entered into with the United States, should be entrusted to me and at the same time observing that he conceived that I should feel it to be my duty, and should have a pride in being entrusted with a negotiation so delicate and interesting, and declaring that it would entitle me to the Red Ribbon.

I ventured to express to His Majesty the reluctance with which I ever gave credit to reports so much in conformity with the expectations of my countrymen very generally manifested, that the United States must soon separate and that their Union could not long subsist. I was no stranger to the constant recourse to such threats whenever the interests of the several divisions of States were thought not to be fairly balanced in laws passed by the General Government. The only moment when the separation of the States was really to be apprehended, was, when the New England States shortly before the close of the last war with Great Britain, formed a Convention at Har[t]ford in Connecticut, for the express purpose of withdrawing from the war, which called upon them for great sacrifices on the Frontier of the British possessions in North America, while their commercial enterprise was completely paralyzed. Of later years the Southern States have talked of separation on account of the repeated high tariff of duties since 1824, on the importation of Foreign Manufactures in order to foster and protect the manufactories established in the North Eastern and middle States. The Southern States had been accustomed to supply themselves with articles of clothing for their slave population upon more reasonable terms from England, than those upon which they could be supplied by the manufacturers of the Northern and Middle States. I wished His Majesty to be aware that I had never witnessed a meeting of Congress since the passage of the Tariff Act of 1824, that the Southern Representatives had not in their speeches held a language amounting to a threat of disobeying the laws passed by the General Government, which they considered unjust, as injurious to their interests, and in their conversations, a separation from time to time, was insinuated. In addition to this irritation manifested generally upon the opening of Congress by the Representatives of the Southern States, it should not be overlooked that Mr Carroll from whom Lady Wellesley's information was probably derived, had one grief in common with the citizens of the Southern States, though a native of a Middle State, Maryland, which was, that he participated in all their difficulties and embarrassments arising from having his property invested in a large slave population.

I promised His Majesty to diligently to inquire, in conformity with his commands, into the nature of any communications which might have

been made to the Foreign Office bearing upon the reports which reached His Majesty of a meditated separation of the United States, and I begged permission to attend His Majesty to lay before him the result of my enquiries.

Upon seeing Lord Palmerston and the Under Secretary, Mr Backhouse, I found that no communication had reached the Foreign Office touching in any manner upon a projected separation of the States.

On the 13th of April I waited upon the King at St James' and informed His Majesty that I could not find in the Foreign Office any confirmation of the reports which His Majesty had condescended to communicate to me, and I repeated that my knowledge of the carelessness with which Americans permitted themselves to talk of separation, while their keen sense of their own interests must obviously prevent them from hastily risking such an event, made me very loth to credit any but exact and official reports indicative of such an intention, and that at all events ample time would be given to Great Britain to adapt her policy to the passing events, and that nothing could be more prejudicial to British interests, than any manifestation of an expectation of such an event.

As the question of separation, according to the report of Lady Wellesley was decidedly to be a separation of the Southern States from the Northern ones, I took the liberty of putting into the King's hands a memorandum of the general divisions of the States, as it is considered in America.

*Northern States* are—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware.

The population of these ten States in 1820 was,—Whites 4,307,643. Free people of colour 107,828. Slaves 22,506.

*The Southern States* may be considered to be as follows—Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana. The population of these eight States including in them the district of Colombia was in 1820—Whites 1,967,296. Free coloured, 91,325. Slaves 1,299,829.

*The Western States* are—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee. The population of these six Western States was in 1820. Whites, 1,607,851. Free coloured 13,670. Slaves 217,218. The territories of Michigan, Arkansas, Florida and the western districts had not in 1820 sufficient population to be admitted into the Union as States.

A consideration of the population of these States proves the imprudence and hopelessness of the Southern States seriously meditating a separation from the Northern States. The magnitude of their slave population which seems to keep them in a state of constant uneasiness, and the distress occasioned by that most expensive mode of agriculture, besides the Naval resources being almost exclusively confined to the ports of the Northern States, seems to render such a separation impossible. It is not probable that they would be joined by the Western States which have been peopled as much by emigration from the New England as the

Southern States, and the outlet for their agricultural produce is by Lake Erie as well as by the Mississippi. Besides the tariff having been supported in Congress by the Representatives of the Western States, the Southern States refused to receive from them their customary supplies of live stock.

My second interview with His Majesty terminated by his desiring me to give the paper which I laid before him to Sir Herbert Taylor and by commanding me to communicate to him anything which might come to my knowledge respecting the reported separation of the States.

On the 24th April I received a letter from Mr McTavish, who married the sister of Lady Wellesley and who lives in the family of Mrs Carroll of Maryland, in which he states, that the tariff question will not be settled until it comes before the House of Representatives, and that the Southern men are determined that there shall be a reduction in the duties and "it is even hinted that these delegations may not take their seats at the next Congress," unless they are met half way by the advocates of the tariff.

This is the only intimation I have had of the disposition of the Southern men to separate. In the Senate a debate had already taken place on resolutions moved by Mr Clay to support the American system, by continuing the high duties of the tariff of 1828, upon articles of Foreign manufacture which can enter into competition with similar articles manufactured in the United States, and the complaints of the Southern States and the arguments of the supporters of the American system may be collected from the speeches which have been transmitted to me by Mr McTavish, of Colonel Hayne of South Carolina and Mr Clay of Kentucky.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 895 424 5